# JOHANN BRENZ'S ROLE IN THE SACRAMENTARIAN CONTROVERSY OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of the Ohio State University

By

John Wesley Constable, B. A., M. A.

* * * * * *

The Ohio State University

1967

Approved by

Gerald J. Grimm

Adviser
Department of History

CONTENTS


| | |
|---|---|
| Vita | iii |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Theological Issues In The Controversy | 35 |
| 3. The Beginnings Of The Controversy | 70 |
| 4. The Height Of The Controversy | 105 |
| 5. Resolution In The Formula of Concord | 156 |
| 6. Conclusions | 180 |
| Bibliography | 193 |

## VITA

| | |
|---|---|
| March 20, 1922 | Born - Baltimore, Maryland |
| 1946 . . . . . | B. A., Concordia Seminary St. Louis, Missouri |
| 1949-1956 . . . . . | University Pastor, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio |
| 1956-1964 . . . . . | University Pastor, The State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa |
| 1960 . . . . . | M. A., The State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa |
| 1961-1962 . . . . . | Danforth Scholar, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio |
| 1964 . . . . . | Assistant Professor, Historical Theology, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri |
| 1966-1967 . . . . . | Acting Chairman, Historical Theology, Concordia Seminary St. Louis, Missouri |

## PUBLICATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| 1965-1966 | Interim Editor, The Concordia Historical Quarterly, St. Louis, Missouri |
| 1966 | Associate Editor, The Concordia Historical Quarterly, St. Louis, Missouri |

## FIELDS OF STUDY

| | |
|---|---|
| Major Field: | Reformation History<br>Roman History<br>Renaissance History<br>South in American History<br>Recent American History |
| Minor Field: | Early Christian and Northern Renaissance Art |

## PREFACE

The research for this dissertation was begun in 1961-1962 while attending Ohio State University under a Campus Christian Worker's grant from the Danforth Foundation. It was completed under a grant from the Aid Association for Lutherans Faculty Fellowship Program in 1967.

I should like to extend my thanks and deep appreciation to Dr. Harold J. Grimm for his patience, counsel, concern, and aid over the years that he has assisted me. A word of deep appreciation and thanks for understanding also goes out to my wife, Ann, and the children who have put up with much over the years of study.

J.W.C.

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

The role of Johann Brenz in the Lutheran Reformation has been a neglected one. There is relatively little recent material that deals with either the man himself or Württemberg, his major area of activity. Most of the attention has properly been drawn to the north around Wittenberg. This is but natural since it is the scene of the labors of Luther, Melanchthon, and Bugenhagen, key figures in the sixteenth-century Lutheran Reformation. The place of Melanchthon has been again recently evaluated by Manschreck.[1] Flacius' most important role in the controversies both during and after the death of Martin Luther had earlier been evaluated in detail by Preger in his work.[2]

The material on Brenz has been noticeably sparse in English and there has been comparatively little done in his native language since the four hundredth anniversary of his birth in 1899. The major work on Brenz, Walther Köhler's

---

[1] Clyde Manschreck, Melanchthon: The Quiet Reformer (New York, 1958).

[2] Wilhelm Preger, Matthias Flaccius Illyricus und Seine Zeit (Erlangen, 1859-61).

Bibliographia Brentiana,[3] is a collection and listing of the existing records of his works. Theodor Pressel has also traced other printed and unprinted works of Brenz in his Anecdota Brentiana.[4] These two works are excellent source references for a study of Brenz's part in the sixteenth-century controversies.

Hartmann and Jäger's work, Johann Brenz: Nach gedruckten und ungedruckten Quellen (According To Printed and Unprinted Sources),[5] is now more than a century old and some of the materials collected and traced by Köhler and Pressel were not available to them. Alfred Brecht's biography, Johannes Brenz, der Reformator Württembergs,[6] is recent but too brief to cover the material here desired. The Christology of Johann Brenz by Otto Fricke[7] is excellent for the scope of this paper. The most recent contribution to the study of the theology of Brenz gives further encouragement toward a growing interest in Reformation studies in southwestern

---

[3]Berlin, 1904. Correspondence with a number of libraries in Europe shows that many of these materials are no longer found in the places Köhler listed.

[4]Theodor Pressel, ed., Anecdota Brentiana: Ungedruckte Briefe und Bedenken von Johannes Brenz (Tubingen, 1868). Hereafter T. P.

[5]Hamburg, 1840-42.

[6]Stuttgart, 1949.

[7]Otto Fricke, Die Christologie des Johann Brenz (Munich, 1927).

Germany.[8]

There are no major works in English which deal with the role of Brenz in the Reformation movements of the sixteenth century.[9] Outside of the standard biographies of the encyclopedias there are only a few articles which examine Brenz's importance. E. V. Wills in the November, 1952 issue of Social Studies briefly records the "Place of Johann Brenz in the History of the Reformation."[10] Dr. George Forell has touched somewhat on his role in the sacramentarian controversy in the Lutheran Church Quarterly of April, 1945.[11] To Charles M. Jacobs one is indebted for an examination of the role of Brenz in the Peasants' Revolt,[12] and Elbert V. Wills gives insights into his small catechism in the July, 1946 issue of the same periodical.[13]

---

[8]Martin Brecht, Die frühe Theologie des Johannes Brenz (Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie, No. 36; Tübingen, 1966). He covers the period from 1522-1530.

[9]James Martin Estes, "Johannes Brenz and the Problem of Church Order in the German Reformation" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, Ohio State University, 1964), is a most recent study of Brenz in English.

[10]Pp. 275-282. A study on Brenz's role as an educator.

[11]"The Lord's Supper and Christology," 91-94.

[12]"Sources of Lutheran History: John Brenz, On the Moderating of the Princes Toward the Rebellious Peasants," Lutheran Church Quarterly, I (1928), 182-190.

[13]"Johann Brenz's Smaller Catechism of 1528," ibid., 271-280.

When attention is turned to Württemberg itself, the case is very similar to that of Brenz. Materials of a general nature are very profuse, but the proliferation of material likewise persists about the turn of the last century, with a few exceptions. Much of the material is difficult to obtain at the present time.

Karl Schottenloher's Bibliographie zur deutschen Geschichte im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung[14] is a rich mine of materials relative to Württemberg. To this could be added the consistent interest of the Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte (Papers on Württemberg Church History) with its concern for both the duchy and Johann Brenz.[15]

It is the purpose of this study to discover the role that both Johann Brenz and the duchy of Württemberg played in one aspect of the Lutheran Reformation. While admittedly a minor figure in the German Reformation, it is the contention here that Brenz of Württemberg has been much underrated and perhaps misunderstood as a result of the role he

---

[14]Six volumes, Leipzig, 1933-40. Bibliography of German History at the Period of the Division of the Faith.

[15]I.e., Hans Rückert, "Die Bedeutung der württembergischen Reformation für den Gang der deutschen Reformationsgeschichte," 38 (1934), 257-280. Julius Rauscher, "Das Augsburgische Bekenntnis in der Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche Württembergs," 4. Sonderheft (1930), 8-17.

played in this controversial era. The controversies in which he actively participated in Germany are particularly two, the Adiaphoristic and the Crypto-Calvinistic. Both of them have grave overtones for that controversy of this century which has been called the "Abendmahlsstreit, or the Sacramentarian controversy." Thus the key to unlock Brenz's Reformation ideas which grew in the favorable atmosphere of Württemberg is the progress of the controversy over the Lord's Supper in relation to the former two theological dilemmas.

To help make this relationship clear, it will be necessary to consider briefly the history of both the duchy in southwestern Germany and one of its most famous native sons. One cannot understand the constant interplay of the controversy with the political, social, and religious events in the land in this frame of reference.

## The Importance of Württemberg for the German Reformation

The duchy at the time of Brenz consisted of an area in the southern and western part of Germany that was roughly bounded on the south by Lake Constance, the north by Franconia, the east by the Lech River, and the west by the Rhine. The area in the sixteenth century consisted of about 3600 square miles and contained nearly 450,000 inhabitants.[16]

---

[16]Rudolf Weeber, trans., "The Lutheran Church in Württemberg," The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church, ed., Julius Henry Bodensieck, III (1965), 2531-34.

Württemberg was really only a geographical expression until the year 1495. Before this time it suffered under the dual stresses of Hapsburg indecision and the recurrent desire of numerous imperial cities to either assert their own autonomy or gain ascendency over the other cities. The resultant duchy was made up of many German cities in this part of Germany, principally members of the old Swabian League, such as Ulm, Augsburg, Reutlingen, and Heilbronn. About the middle of the fourteenth century these cities had brought into being the territory which we call Württemberg.

The struggle between the declining knights and the rising imperial cities forced several reshufflings within the League late in the same century. The League sought to protect its cities against the lesser nobles of the south and to maintain their imperial rights. The cities demanded security from the emperor against either the involuntary sale of the cities or the mortgaging of the same or against prohibitive taxation by the nobles.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century the Swabian area was the scene of widespread anarchy as the cities fought among themselves for control of the League. On February 14, 1488, the Great Swabian League was formed to resolve the nearly one hundred years of internal power-seeking strife between these imperial cities. These twenty-two cities chose as their first captain, Count Eberhard V

of the Württemberg-Urach family, the foremost prince of the Swabian circle of cities. In the year 1495 the Emperor Maximilian declared them to be an indivisible unit and granted the cities the rank of a duchy. In the Reformation century to follow, the Swabians wavered both in their support of their Hapsburg patrons and in their theological interest in the Reformation doctrines.

At the death of Count Eberhard in 1496, the Urach branch died out and the control of the duchy passed into the hands of Duke Ulrich, then only eleven years old. In the years of his rule that followed, Ulrich alienated the people by ruling in a very arbitrary fashion.[17] Once, in order to retain his duchy, he had to permit Maximilian to serve as an arbiter between him and his people. The result of the struggle between duke and people was the Treaty of Tübingen on July 8, 1514, which pledged Ulrich to consult with his estates before acting. This treaty also set the basis for the duchy's constitution. Ulrich courted the disfavor of the people with his many violations of the treaty.

Ulrich likewise fell out of favor with the Emperor,

---

[17]Henry C. Vedder, The Reformation in Germany (New York, 1914), p. 343. He calls Ulrich "one of the worst German princes of the age, and that is saying much. He had all the faults of the age, public and private, that a ruler could well have, and if he had any virtues he contrived to conceal them so thoroughly that no contemporary mentions them."

when, in 1515, he murdered Hans von Hutten, a noble and a favorite of the Hapsburgs. The imperial ban was pronounced upon him, but he escaped its enforcement for the moment. Ulrich still had not learned to rule in other than a dictatorial fashion. His demands upon the duchy increased. He burned villages and castles in his struggle with cities and knights for control. The ducal armies attacked Reutlingen and drove it into submission. Other cities of the Swabian League took offense at the duke's high-handed actions and, in 1519, under the direction of Duke William of Bavaria, conquered Württemberg. Ulrich regrouped his forces and attacked Stuttgart only to find the League united against him. He again came under the imperial ban, but at the death of Maximilian again escaped its enforcement. The duchy, however, had had enough of Ulrich for the moment and he was driven into an exile which lasted for fifteen years. With the election of Charles V in 1519 as also the "count of Swabia," the duchy now pledged itself to support the new emperor.

In February, 1520, the Swabian League sold the duchy of Württemberg to the Hapsburgs for 220,000 guilders. Charles was very much interested in the area since it served as a natural link between Hapsburg possessions in the Tyrol and Austria. To the newly purchased area Charles sent an imperial ambassador. An imperial ambassador, Grenvelle, was

destined to play an important role in the imperial opposition to the Reformation and in the personal life of Brenz. Charles, at war with both the Turks and the French, soon found that he could not effectively control the duchy. He then ceded it to his brother Ferdinand in 1523. The cities of the duchy soon developed an antipathy toward the Hapsburgs since their financial demands were no less severe than those of Ulrich. Furthermore, they had been recently introduced to the Reformation by such men as Brenz, Erhard Schnepf, and Ambrosius Blarer. Upon learning of the conversion of their former duke to the Protestant cause, the discontented cities of the duchy called for a restoration. Since Ulrich had now become a Protestant, the issue was no longer only a political one in the eyes of Ferdinand, a convinced Roman Catholic.

With the financial support of both the French and Philip of Hesse, Ulrich assembled an army and defeated the Hapsburg forces of Ferdinand in May, 1534. At the Treaty of Kaaden, Ferdinand agreed to the restoration of Ulrich if he would enfief his duchy to the Hapsburgs. The restored duke began again to squeeze the duchy for funds to repay his war debts.

Ulrich thus officially brought the Reformation to his area and also solved his financial problems when he took over church properties after his restoration. Until his death in 1550 he was generally financially independent and thus able to control both the religious and political

situation within Württemberg. The control of the lands remained in his hands with the exception of the period of the Smalcaldic War, 1546-47. He was then again briefly expelled, but restored by Charles as a political necessity. By the Augsburg Interim of 1547 the Emperor attempted to bring back the duchy to the Roman Catholic faith with the return of all ecclesiastical property to the church. Charles V at this time also attempted to restore the Swabian League, but failed. Ulrich died in 1550, but before his death, he was again able to bring the Roman Catholic areas under his personal control.

Duke Christopher (1550-1568), son of Ulrich and a Lutheran, became the successor in the duchy. Although he suffered some financial problems as a result of sixteenth-century inflation, he was able to control both the political and theological problems of his rule and to bring about a church settlement in favor of the Lutheran cause. He brought Johann Brenz into a prominent church position in Stuttgart, supported his development of various church orders in the duchy, and appointed him to the vital role of ducal counsellor. The Reformation finally became firmly established in Württemberg under Christopher through the efforts of Brenz and his Great Church Order of 1559.

The social situation within the duchy differed in some details from other German areas. The duchy consisted of

some fifty small towns and villages, with Stuttgart and Tübingen as the most important. The former was the ducal seat and the latter the site of the university. The entire southwestern part of Germany was replete with imperial cities, lands under imperial knights, and many lands under church control. The nobles were not a large or major group and were generally under the employ of the dukes. The position of the peasants was better than elsewhere and the rapport between the towns and the country was usually good, at least until the Reformation got under way. It was only then that the rural areas showed some reluctance to accept the new faith, a condition which somewhat parallels that of Switzerland. The "poor Conrad" movement of 1514 was an early peasant revolt in the area of Württemberg. The issue was over the duke's misguided attempts to control inflation. The revolt was only partially successful.[18]

There was also a strong parliamentary tradition within the duchy. The dukes administered their control through the Amt, or administrative district. In the fifteenth century three estates are represented in the Landtag, or diet, of Württemberg: nobles or knights, clergy, and townsmen. The lot of representing the rural interests fell to the townsmen.

---

[18] F. L. Carsten, Princes and Parliaments in Germany: From the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century (New York, 1959), p. 10.

Power in the estates in the late fifteenth century gradually gravitated toward the urban Ehrbarkeit, a group of wealthy townsmen who sought to develop an oligarchy. The knights left the diet and refused to attend, claiming their rights as free, imperial knights. Opposition arose to the Ehrbarkeit, many of whom were Roman Catholic, from the common burghers who had joined the Protestant cause.

When Duke Ulrich returned to power in 1534, he further weakened the power of the diet. He now got his funds from the church properties he had taken over and also from his dealings with individual cities or groups of cities outside of the estates. His dependence on the diet thus declined and he failed either to call or consult with it, even on religious questions. The Ehrbarkeit was pro-Hapsburg and thus papal and Ulrich worked to control the power of both. The wealthy urban class got more power after Mühlberg in 1547, during the Augsburg Interim, and after the restoration of Roman church property. Under Duke Christopher, however, the diet was called more often to deal with problems of the economy of the duchy. It supported the Duke's work of Reformation, the revocation of the Interim in 1552, and the replacement of priests with Protestant clergy.

It was in such a political, social, and religious world that Johann Brenz lived and that the controversy which brings him to prominence in Reformation Germany, took place. .

It was here in this duchy of Württemberg that most of his activities took place.

The Importance of Johann Brenz for the Reformation in Germany

Johann Brenz was born June 24, 1499, at Weil, near Stuttgart. His father, Martin, was a town official for a number of years. His mother, Katherine (nee Henning), was a pious woman who communicated her piety to her son. Brecht[19] calls Brenz "a son of the church in his youth" who, in his early days, composed a poem to the honor of Leo X.

In his eleventh year Brenz went to the Latin School at Heidelberg and changed in the next year to another school under the direction of Johann Schmidlin in Vaihingen. Later he returned to Heidelberg where he studied under Erhard Schnepf of Heilbronn and Johann Oecolampadius of Weinsberg, two men who were later to come into prominence in the Reformation and in relation to Brenz with regard to the Sacramentarian Controversy. While at the university he became a close friend of Johann Isenmann, later his father-in-law. Other close friends at Heidelberg were Martin Frecht of Ulm, Johann Lachmann of Heilbronn, and Martin Bucer of Alsace.[20]

---

[19]Alfred Brecht, op. cit., p. 9.

[20]Hastings Eells, Martin Bucer (New Haven, 1931), p. 75. Eells refers to Bucer as a student of Brenz, but at this time they were fellow students.

In April, 1518, Luther appeared at Heidelberg before the council of the German Chapter of the Saxon province of the Augustinian friars. He had come to the meeting to defend the theological issues of the Ninety-five Theses. Brenz, with Bucer and Schnepf, heard him speak at this meeting and was much impressed with him and his theological position.

Brenz had entered Heidelberg in 1512. He received the baccalaureate degree in 1516 and the master's the following year. He then proceeded to theological studies. In 1520 he was ordained a priest at Speyer and in that year celebrated his first mass in his home town of Weil.

As regent of the Realistenbursa (a student hostel for supporters of Realism) from 1518 to 1522 he delivered philological and philosophical lectures. In addition he lectured on the Gospel of Matthew. Students found him a very popular lecturer. There is a suggestion that he was threatened with a trial for heresy because of his novel exegesis of St. Matthew,[21] but this seems improbable. In 1522 he was installed as pastor at Schwäbisch-Hall. If heresy, not popularity, had been the reason for leaving the Realistenbursa, it is very doubtful that he would have been

---

[21]Gustav Bossert, "Johann Brenz," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge (New York, 1908), II, 260.

selected for this church. On September 8, 1522, he presented a test sermon at St. Michael's in Hall. On the basis of this and through the influence of his friend, Johann Isenmann, Brenz was installed as priest of the new church there. Michael Graeter, the priest of St. Catherine's in Hall, was also numbered among Brenz's friends.

This apparently was an important juncture in the life of Johann Brenz. From this point on he definitely moved away from the Roman Church. The Festival of Corpus Christi was eliminated by his efforts in 1524, and on Christmas Day, 1525, "he celebrated the Lord's Supper in the evangelical manner,"[22] the congregation receiving the elements in both kinds.

Brenz became involved in the uprisings of the peasants, known as the Peasants' War of 1524-25, as did Luther. Luther had published two tracts on the matter, one of which has come in for much criticism for its harsh attitude toward the peasants. The first was published about the middle of May and the second about the first of June, 1525. "The tract of Johann Brenz, 'Von Milderung der Fürsten gegen die aufrührischen Bauern' (On the Moderating of the Princes Toward the Rebellious Peasants), was written between

---

[22]Alfred Brecht, op. cit., p. 20.

these two little books of Luther."[23] Brenz's general argument is based on Romans 13: "the powers that be are ordained of God." He held that "it is divine if the rebels are punished with the sword according to the law ... but the rulers may also take a Christian attitude in the matter, that is, pardon their rebellious subjects."[24]

Brenz, with a dozen other pastors of Swabia, published Syngramma Suevicum (Swabian Consensus) October 21, 1525. This work marks his entry into the reform of the church on a much wider basis than that of his own church or town. It was a clear support of the doctrine of the real presence in the Lord's Supper. Luther was obviously pleased with it and personally wrote an introduction for the subsequent German version.[25] From this point on, Brenz participated in all the important theological meetings as a representative of the Lutheran cause of South Germany.

Late in 1526 Brenz published a work containing sermons on the issue of the sacrament as stated in the Syngramma.[26]

---

[23]C. M. Jacobs, "On the Moderating of the Princes Toward the Rebellious Peasants, 1525," Lutheran Church Quarterly, I (1928), 183.

[24]Ibid., p. 188.

[25]Johann George Walch, ed., Dr. Martin Luthers Sämmtliche Schriften (St. Louis, 1881-1910), XX, 521-581. Hereafter as Walch.

[26]Walther Köhler, Bibliographia Brentiana (Berlin, 1904), 19. Hereafter as Köhler, Brentiana.

This work re-emphasized his stand on the real presence as defined in the previous work, both of which had been drawn up in opposition to Oecolampadius' stand on the Lord's Supper. This is Brenz's answer to the Billiche Antwort (Reasonable Answer) of Oecolampadius published on July 18, 1526, as his reply to the Swabian Syngramma. It also marks the entry of Brenz both into the realm of polemical literature and into the Sacramentarian Controversy.

The year 1528 saw the production of two catechisms, a larger and a smaller one, which are known as the Fragestücken des christlichen Glaubens (A Number of Questions on the Christian Faith). It is of interest to note that these appeared before Luther's famous one of 1529. Brenz's catechisms continued in use for many years and were also of great influence outside of Germany. They were not the first of the many of this type, but were significant in that they became established for the duchy of Württemberg when the Great Church Order of the duchy was drawn up in 1559.

Brenz's influence was felt in a much broader area through his efforts in the establishment of various Kirchenordnungen (Church Orders) for South Germany. In 1526 he drafted the order for the imperial city of Schwäbisch-Hall. In later years he worked with the towns of Ulm, Esslingen, and Nürtigen and in the service of Margrave George of Brandenburg-Ansbach in the drawing up of additional church

orders.

Brenz joined Luther and other leaders of the reforming parties at Marburg in 1529.[27] It became evident at these meetings with the Zwinglians that Brenz sided completely with Luther on the matter of the sacrament.

The life of Brenz became more wrapped up in the Lutheran Reformation as we see him invited to Augsburg. He was instrumental here in the development of the Confession as presented by Melanchthon. There already is a suggestion here of the future differences of opinion between Brenz and Melanchthon. A sign of the growing importance of the role of Brenz in the Reformation can be found in the invitation he received to the meeting.[28] Luther turned to Brenz for information on the Diet which he could not attend because of the decree of Worms.[29] Brenz's position at the meeting also moved Margrave George to invite him to an assembly of the Smalcald League.[30]

---

[27]Hartmann and Jäger, op. cit., I, 173-174 records the invitation of Philip of Hesse to Brenz.

[28]T. P., 41. Philip of Hesse wrote personally to invite him.

[29]Ibid., 66, 67, 72. See K. G. Bretschneider, et al., Corpus Reformatorum (Berlin and Leipzig, 1834 ff.), II, 718-720 for Brenz's role in relation to Melanchthon and Philip of Hesse. Hereafter called C. R.

[30]T. P., 89 (xxvii) tells of George's invitation and T. P., 90 gives Brenz's promise to attend on December 22, 1530.

Brenz married in the last days of the year. His wife was Margaret Wetzel (nee Graeter), a relative of Michael Graeter, the priest of St. Catherine's in Hall and long a personal friend of Brenz.

In the years that followed the Diet of Augsburg, Brenz was busily engaged in working with various cities in the promulgation of church orders. They were made possible by the Religious Peace of Nuremberg of July 23, 1532, which held that the Lutherans were not to be molested. The Emperor granted this concession in the hope that the Lutheran cities and princes might help him in his war against the Turks. The Religious Peace was to be in effect until such time as a general council would be held. The pope, Clement VII, still refused to call one.

In 1532 Brenz collaborated with Osiander in the formulation of church orders for Brandenburg and Nuremberg. The latter one is particularly significant for Nuremberg was an area contiguous with Württemberg and represented a spread of Reformation influence further into southwestern Germany. While here in Nuremberg he continued his friendship with Lazarus Spengler. Both Heilbronn and Dinkelbühl also asked Brenz for assistance in the formulation of their church orders according to a Lutheran plan.

As we have seen, Duke Ulrich had regained his duchy in 1534 through the Peace of Kaaden. He, too, asked for

the aid and guidance of Brenz in the establishment of a church order for his duchy. There was some confusion on the nature of the settlement to be made there. Schnepf tended toward the Lutheran position and Blarer, who was a friend of Zwingli, opted for Zwinglianism. In the same year of Ulrich's return, the Stuttgart Concord was signed to try to prevent controversies in Württemberg between both reforming parties.

The Diet of the League of Smalcald opened its membership to all cities which had accepted the Augsburg Confession. Brenz, now in a position of importance in his native duchy, was reluctant at first to have Württemberg join the League, but finally, in 1536, he changed his mind and it joined, together with Hamburg and Hannover from the north of Germany.

In that year the first Württemberg Kirchenordnung appeared, produced under the leadership of Erhard Schnepf and Ambrosius Blarer. Brecht has tried to show that the ideas on the sacrament were influenced by Brenz.[31]

Luther and Bucer met at Wittenberg in this year to discuss the matters that separated them. After several days of discussion on the matter, they rejoiced over what was supposed to be a solution to their differences. Brenz

---

[31]Alfred Brecht, op. cit., p. 32.

was likewise a participant in this meeting which produced the Wittenberg Concord on May 29, 1536.

Pope Paul III finally issued a call for a general council to be held in May, 1537, at Mantua. The Lutherans prepared the Smalcald Articles to set forth their position for the council. Brenz was present at Smalcald and participated in the discussions which led to the adoption of the Articles.

Brenz next went to the University of Tübingen with the express purpose of completing the Reformation in its midst. He had been recommended for the work by Melanchthon. Within the year he was able to fill all the chairs with men favorable to the Lutheran position. He had thoroughly accomplished the task by mid 1538. He took time out from this most important work to attend the conference on images held in September, 1537, at Urach, where he strongly urged their abolition. In April, 1538, he returned to his position at Hall.

The electors Joachim of Brandenburg and Louis of the Palatinate tried to get the Roman Catholic Holy League and the League of Smalcald together to mediate their differences. Brenz was a prominent figure at these meetings. The preliminary meetings held in February and March, 1539, resulted only in a truce of fifteen months, signed by both parties on April 29, 1539. Two

other meetings held at Hagenau and Worms in the two succeeding years ended in failure and the two groups remained armed camps.

In April, 1541, Charles V called the representatives of both sides to the Diet of Regensburg and ordered them to discuss the points that divided them. This they did on the basis of a compromise document, the Regensburg Book of April 5. Neither of the sides was content with it since it was about half Roman Catholic and half Lutheran.

Brenz in 1542 received numerous calls to other places and other parishes, including Leipzig, but declined them. Much of his time in 1543 was consumed in working on a revision of the church regulations for Hall. At this time he received a call to Tübingen, which he also refused.

The Religious Peace of Nuremberg of 1532 had been renewed several times and was about to expire in 1545. With its expiration the Emperor would be free to persecute the German heretics. The Council of Trent was also called to meet in this year.

Cochlaeus, the Roman Catholic theologian, met with Brenz in January, 1546, in an attempt to reconcile the two parties, but with no success. The Smalcaldic War began in February, 1546, as an attempt of Charles V and the Holy League to wipe out the Lutherans. On July 20, 1546, the Emperor published his ban against the Reformation parties.

When Martin Luther died, February 18, 1546, the leadership of his followers fell into the hands of others. Brenz emerged as the leader in the south, and Melanchthon as the leader in the north.

On December 16, 1546, Charles took the city of Hall. Brenz fled only to return on January 4, 1547. He then managed to maintain himself and stay in the city until June 24, 1548. An imperial chancellor, Granvelle, appeared in the town council, swore the councilors to an oath of secrecy, and demanded that Brenz be delivered over to him. Ratsherr Bueschler arrived at the meeting after the oath had been administered and thus felt himself free to report the matter. The information was given to Isenmann who related it to his friend. Brenz heeded the advice of the note, urging, "Flee, Brenz, quickly, more quickly, most quickly."[32]

Charles V defeated the Smalcald League at the Battle of Mühlberg on April 24, 1547. With the support of Duke Maurice of Saxony who had joined his side against the Lutherans, he was able to capture both Philip of Hesse and John Frederick of Saxony in this battle.

---

[32]Alfred Brecht, op. cit., p. 40. "Fuge, fuge, Brenz, cito, citius, citissime."

Brenz, who fled "from one mouse hole to another,"[33] was sought everywhere. He stopped at Hohenwittlingen in his flight and there adopted the name "Wittlingus" as an alias used for communicating with his friends. He then travelled through the Black Forest, past Strassburg, to Basel. In Switzerland he was kindly received by Calvin and also met Christopher, who was to become the duke of Württemberg in 1550 and a staunch supporter of Brenz.

After the Battle of Mühlberg Charles forced the Augsburg Interim on the Lutherans of South Germany on May 15, 1548. Brenz's opposition to this interim forced him to again flee. Among other things, this decree permitted Protestant clergy to marry and to celebrate the Lord's Supper in both kinds. The Interim was to be in effect until the Council of Trent should decide what to do. The document brought up the question of adiaphora, a matter of deep consequence for the progress of the Sacramentarian Controversy, as we shall see. Brenz, as well as many others, was unhappy about the "Interitus or ruin,"[34] as he called it.

Maurice of Saxony had heard of Charles' enforcement of the Augsburg Interim and feared the same treatment in the north. He again changed sides in the controversy and

---

[33] Ibid., p. 41.

[34] C. R., 7, 289.

threw in his lot with the Lutherans.

A number of princes met at Celle, or Altzella, in November and drew up their own Interim. It really laid the basic idea for the Leipzig Interim which followed on December 22, 1548. The latter provided that both parties

> should receive what the church teaches "as she shall and cannot command anything contrary to the Holy Scriptures"; ministers obey the bishops; baptism be administered according to the ancient rites; confirmation and extreme unction be allowed as in the early church; repentance, confession, and absolution be taught without auricular enumeration; ministers be examined before ordination; the idea of the meritorious sacrifice be omitted from the mass; that bell-ringing, lights, vessels, costumes, and other ceremonies be retained; ministers be allowed to wed or not to wed; pictures be permitted in the churches, but not worship of them; singing be allowed; certain holidays be observed; meat not be eaten on Friday or Saturday during Lent; and clergymen to wear distinctive dress.[35]

Melanchthon was willing to sign the Interim in the hope that peace might return to the church. His action showed a position relative to the question of adiaphora which plays an important role in his attitude in the sacramentarian controversy of later years. The editors of the Triglotta have observed that it "probably cost Melanchthon his prestige and leadership in the church."[36]

---

[35] Ibid., 7, 248-249.

[36] F. Bente, ed., Concordia Triglotta (St. Louis, 1921), p. 100. Melanchthon had generally been looked to for leadership after Luther. Now Flacius and Brenz and others attacked him for his support of the Interim. They accused him of disturbing the doctrines of Luther and thus bringing on dissension.

Duke Ulrich called Brenz to Moempelgard in January, 1549. Here Brenz learned of the death of his wife. As he was worried over his children, he went to Burg Hornberg near Stuttgart. While there for eighteen months he used the pseudonym Huldrich Engster, or Encaustius. During this period he declined calls offered to him by Magdeburg, Königsberg, and England.

It is necessary at this point to discuss the party situation that had arisen in the Lutheran Church after the death of Luther. "Interimists," "Synergists," "Crypto-Calvinists," "Philippists," or "Melanchthonians" are the various names given the men who turned to Melanchthon for leadership. The main field of their work was in electoral Saxony with the universities of Wittenberg and Leipzig as the chief centers of their activity. They tended to be very much interested in any attempt at reconciliation with the Roman Catholics or agreement with other Protestants and thus showed a tendency toward compromise. Joachim Camerarius, Paul Eber, Caspar Cruciger, Johann Pfeffinger, Georg Major, Johann Stoessel, and Georg Cracow were some of the prominent leaders of this party.

At the other extreme were the "Gnesio-Lutherans" of Ducal Saxony. Their centers of activity were Magdeburg and the University of Jena. They were the "echtes Luther-gut," or pure Lutheran followers, who held to a strict

doctrinal position and "the simple Biblical truth as Luther understood it."[37] Among their followers were numbered Matthias Flacius, Nicholas Amsdorf, Johann Wigand, Nicholas Gallus, Matthias Judex, Joachim Morlin, Tilemann Hesshusius, Joachim Westphal, and Simon Musaeus.

The third party had no definite name but often held a central or mediating position and took a very small part in the controversies within the church. Many of them later took major roles in the settling of the controversies between the extreme parties and were leaders in the framing of the Formula of Concord of 1580. The leaders of this party were Johann Brenz, Jakob Andreae, Martin Chemnitz, Nikolas Selneccer, David Chytraeus, and Christoph Cornerus. They have been described as being opposed to all "unnecessary logomarchies, i. e., controversies involving no doctrinal differences, ... and approving all controversies really necessary in the interest of truth."[38] It seems as though all the religious controversies in the history of the Lutheran Church during the last days of the life of Luther and the subsequent years of the sixteenth century were "controversies really necessary in the interest of truth."

---

[37] Ibid., p. 102.

[38] Ibid., p. 103.

It is to be remembered that these parties were in the process of development before the middle of the century but did not come strongly to the fore until after 1546. They then began to show themselves in the controversies which troubled the Lutheran Church for the next half-century.

Two of these controversies, the Crypto-Calvinistic and the Adiaphoristic, have a direct bearing on the subject of this study, the Sacramentarian Controversy. Subsequent chapters of this work will deal with these in depth.

The Majoristic Controversy of 1551-1566 was led by Georg Major and Justus Menius. The troubling question was over the place of good works in the scheme of salvation. The Majorists were inclined to defend a position that was related to Rome's semi-Pelagianism, namely, that good works were necessary for salvation. The reaction was a typical one in theological controversy in which both sides tended to go to extremes. The Gnesio-Lutherans opposed the thesis and Amsdorf, even said that good works are detrimental to salvation. The matter was not eventually settled until the adoption of Article IV of the Formula of Concord.

The Philippists received the name of Synergists from the controversy which ran from 1555-1560. Their general thesis was that man by his own natural powers cooperates in his conversion. Melanchthon, Pfeffinger, Eber, Major, and others held this position. The opponents were naturally

the Gnesio-Lutherans under the guidance of Amsdorf, Flacius, Judex, and Hesshusius. It was their contention that "God alone converts men.... He does not exclude the will, but all efficaciousness and operation of the same."[39] The matter died down after the death of Melanchthon in 1560 but was not finally settled until Article II of the Formula of Concord was accepted.

The followers of Melanchthon were not the only ones who were leaders and stimulators of controversy. Flacius set off along the path in the controversy which bears his name. The Philippists opposed Flacius' ideas that original sin is not an "accident" of man, but the very substance of fallen man. Almost everyone in the period 1560-1575 opposed this concept.

The Osiandrian, or Stancarian, Controversy of 1549 to 1566 was over the question of the value of the human nature of Christ. The church had taught that doctrine of Luther that a man was declared just (forensic justification) by and through the entire work of Jesus according to both His active and passive obedience.[40] In this Luther held that

---

[39] Ibid., p. 126.

[40] Obedience in the theological sense refers to the keeping of the Old Testament Law. In the active sense Christ satisfied the demands of the Law and in the passive sense he paid the penalty for sin or the breaking of the Law by men.

Jesus acted according to both His human and divine natures. Osiander taught that Christ is our righteousness only according to His divine nature and not the human. Stancarius taught that Christ is our righteousness according to His human nature only. Flacius and Melanchthon and their supporting parties joined in their opposition to both concepts. The authors of the Formula of Concord had this controversy in mind when they framed Article III.

There were a number of other smaller and more local controversies which broke out during the lifetime of Brenz which need not be considered here. An extensive discussion of them is contained in the Historical Introduction to the Concordia Triglotta.[41]

It remains here to see how Brenz was involved in some of these controversies before delving into the two major ones that relate to the Sacramentarian Controversy. One finds it difficult to believe that he could have been so conversant with these issues since at the time he was fleeing from the Emperor's troops. Yet he was intimately involved in both the Osiandrian and the Synergistic Controversies from 1549 through 1560. These two are related since the former deals with the character and the nature of justification and the latter with man's conversion.

---

[41] Op. cit., pp. 102-194.

The position of Brenz in the Osiandrian Controversy has been criticized by some,[42] perhaps because he wrote so much on the matter. Two major works of his appeared on the subject in 1551 and 1552.[43] The flood of material continued on this matter of justification when in 1553 three more works were published by Brenz.[44] Pressel lists a number of other tracts and letters written by him on the matter of Osiander's aberration.[45] Bossert's statement, in his analysis of the Osiandrian Controversy, that "Brenz saw in this controversy nothing but a war of words,"[46] seems too simple to accept. Rather, Brenz supported Osiander out of personal friendship and from his close relationship with Osiander's place of labor, Nuremberg.

The year 1553 found Brenz at Neuberg to help arrange

---

[42]Gustav Bossert, in Schaff-Herzog, op. cit., II, 261.

[43]Köhler, Brentiana, 207. Christlicher und Gründlicher bericht von der Rechtfertigung des Glaubens Einwonung Gottes und Christi in uns and 210, Von der Rechtfertigung des Glaubens aus seinem Buchern da er am aller kleristen redet gezogen.

[44]Ibid., 234, 235, 237. Über dem Artikel von unsär armen Sünder Rechtfertigung und waren ewiger Gerechtigkeit erhaben ... von der Lere herrn Andreae Osiandri ..., Der herrn Johann Brentii und anderer Wirtemberischen Theologen Declaration über Osianders Disputation von der Rechtfertigung, and Brentii und Osiandri meinung vom ampt Christi und rechtfertigung des Sünders.

[45]T. P., 353 ff.

[46]In Schaff-Herzog, op. cit., II, 261.

the affairs of the Palatinate. He did, however, find time to continue in the justification debate.[47] It was here that he met Bartholomäus Hagen, a clergyman from Nürtigen, whom we shall meet as an active participant at the height of the Sacramentarian Controversy.

Brenz was made provost of the cathedral at Stuttgart on September 24, 1554, and counsellor of Duke Christopher for life. These were the years in which Brenz was constantly working on the Württemberg Church Order which found its full expression in the Great Church Order of 1559. Kaspar Leyser and Jakob Andreae, hoping for a unifying church order for all Germany proposed, in 1554, a form which was closely modelled after the Calvinistic form, but Brenz opposed it and the matter was forgotten.

Brenz continued to refuse other appointments such as the ones offered to him in 1555 from England, Denmark, and Magdeburg, preferring to remain in southern Germany to carry on the work of Reformation there.

Brenz's activities centered in Frankenthal in 1558 where a dialogue was held with the Schwenkfelders. It was as unproductive as the meeting held that same year with

---

[47] Köhler, Brentiana, 258 and 268. Bekenntniss Brentii und andern Wirtembergischen Theologen von der Rechtfertigung and Johannis Brentii und anderen im zugeordenten Theologen vonn der Rechtfertigung.

the Jesuit Canisius at Worms. It was, however, significant that the Roman leader had held that those who subscribed to the Variata could be condemned and excluded since they were not true Lutherans. This was designed as a wedge between Melanchthon and Brenz, a fact that did not go unnoticed by either man.

Stuttgart in 1559 was the scene of a synod for those who held to the Augustana of 1530 in an attempt to resolve Lutheran issues that divided the areas of South Germany. On December 28, 1560, the Wittenbergers also came to Stuttgart to present their views on the divisive issues.

In 1561 Brenz and Duke Christopher met with Cardinal Guise of Lorraine at Zabern to urge him to help the French Protestants in their struggle with King Anthony of Navarre. There were no tangible results of this meeting since the Cardinal was interested in political help and not in a spiritual movement such as the Reformation.

At the Reuss-Schoenburg Conference of 1567 Brenz and others led the opposition to the Variata. The loyal Lutherans unqualifiedly condemned it, adhering to "the old, true, unaltered Augsburg Confession, which was later changed, mutilated, misinterpreted, and falsified."[48]

---

[48]Triglotta, op. cit., p. 25.

Brenz's influence has also been traced[49] to Aalen, Leutkirch, and Baden in Germany, and to Holland, Italy, and England. Much has been made of his influence, particularly in England,[50] but his influence there was general rather than specific.

Later in life, in 1568 and 1569, Brenz corresponded with Duke William of Juelich and Julius of Brunswick-Wolfenbuettel on how to reform their areas along Lutheran lines. This is cited to illustrate the importance of Brenz in areas thought to be strongly influenced by Melanchthon.

Brenz, in 1569, probably suffered a stroke which left him paralyzed until his death in Stuttgart on September 11, 1570. He was buried beneath the pulpit of the cathedral under the words, "Voce, stylo, pietate, fide, candore probatus - renowned for his eloquence, style, piety, faithfulness, and candour."[51] When the Counter Reformation spread over South Germany in subsequent years, the Jesuits destroyed the grave of Brenz.

---

[49]Alfred Brecht, op. cit., p. 54.

[50]Henry Eyster Jacobs, The Lutheran Movement in England (Philadelphia, 1916), p. 325 ff.

[51]Thomas Fuller, Abel Redevivus (London, 1867), p. 352.

## CHAPTER TWO

## THEOLOGICAL ISSUES IN THE CONTROVERSY

The church has given many answers to the question, "Exactly how is Christ present in the sacrament of His Holy Supper?" It was the one question that concerned the reformers of the sixteenth century more than any other. Brenz early became involved in the attempt to find an answer to this question. A study of its background will show that Brenz's answer was within the stream of tradition, but not the only possible one.

In addition to the historical interest in the prior development of sacramental thought before the Reformation century, attention needs to be drawn to the five main issues that concerned the adversaries in the controversy. The first concerns the person of Christ with an emphasis upon the two natures in the personal union. The second one that troubled Brenz and the others was over the exact place of the body of Christ, or the session of Christ. An interest in the meaning of John, chapter 6, engaged their attention as the third issue. Their fourth concern was over the medieval concept of the ubiquity. Lastly, they were interested in the question whether unworthy as well as worthy communicants also received the body and blood

of Christ in the sacrament.

## The Person of Jesus Christ

A "person" (<u>persona</u>, ὑπόστασις) in the theological sense is understood as an individual and rational being that exists by itself. Thus it is said of God that He consists of three persons. God is in three persons, the Trinity.

The matter of the nature of Christ was really the first major question to disturb the early church. The first ecumenical council of the church was held at Nicea in 325 to try to give a definition of the doctrine. The second article of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed put it in this manner:

> I believe ... in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made; who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; He suffered and was buried; and the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures; and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and He shall come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.

The Athanasian Creed dealt also with the problem of the person of Christ and served as a summary of the "catholic faith" on this matter:

> ... Neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance. For there is one person of the

> Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost.... It is necessary to everlasting salvation that he also believe faithfully the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man; ...who, although He be God and Man, yet He is not two, but one Christ; One, not by taking the manhood into God; one altogether; not by the confusion of substance, but by the unity of Person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ.

The early church of the fourth and fifth centuries was also troubled by such heresies concerning the person of Christ as the Monophysite (that Christ had one physis or nature), the Monothelite (one will), and the Apollinarian (that the divine nature took the place of the human). These and other doctrinal aberrations concerning the person of Christ were dealt with from the Council of Nicea through the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, among others.

In the controversy over the sacrament in the sixteenth century the edicts of these councils were extensively used by the different reformers when concerning themselves with the person of Christ. Accusations that hearkened back to these early days were thrown about by both sides in the century of the Reformation. Thus the Formula of Concord speaks of the "New Arians" who "teach that Christ is not a true, essential, natural God, but one eternal divine essence with God the Father, but is only adorned with divine majesty

inferior to, and beside, God the Father."[1]

The question of the personal union settles around the nature of the two parts of Jesus Christ, His human and His divine nature. How are these two to be defined and how are they related to each other? It troubled the medieval church and it troubled the Reformation churches no less. The Roman Church solved the question by council edicts; the reforming churches came to differing solutions to the problem.

It was generally held that there were two natures in Jesus and that they were individual and separate ones. They did not grow together, nor were they glued together as two boards, as the Nestorians of the fifth century had held. The natures were dependent and yet independent. Jesus was truly God conceived by the Holy Ghost and truly Man, born of the Virgin Mary. He was at all times God and Man when here upon the earth. In general, the major reformers believed essentially the same concerning His nature.

The difference came in the manner in which these two natures interacted with each other in the nature and work of the God-Man, Jesus Christ. Luther stressed the de communione natuarum (the communion of the natures) and de communicatione idiomatum (the communication of the attributes).

---

[1]Triglotta, Thorough Declaration, p. 1101.

He held that the man Jesus Christ could never be anywhere that God was not, and vice versa. He said:

> Wherever you can say, "Here is God," there you must also say, "Christ the man is also here." And if you would point out a place where God was and not the man, then the person would be divided already, since I might say with truth, "Here is God, who is not man, and never became man."... No, friend, wherever you place God for me, there you must also place for me the human nature. They cannot be separated and divided from each other. There has come to be only one person.[2]

Luther held that both natures of Christ had their own peculiar characteristics or attributes and kept them intact. There were times, however, when one nature communicated its attributes to the other and it seemed as if only one were present and acting. Luther developed from this conception of the communication of attributes the two states of Christ, humiliation and exaltation. In the former state Christ sometimes did not always fully use all the powers of His divine nature which were communicated to His human nature. Examples of this activity of Christ are His incarnation, suffering under Pontius Pilate, crucifixion, death, and burial. In His exaltation, Christ fully used all the divine powers that were communicated to the human nature. The descent into hell, the resurrection, ascension, and sitting on the right hand of God are good

---

[2] D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe (Weimar, 1883 - ), XXVI, 322. Hereafter W. A.

examples of this usage.

Luther held that each nature participated in the work of the other through this communication. This type of argumentation is vital to his conception of the real presence in the sacrament. Christ, by the personal union, is and can be present according to both natures as He sees fit, and for Luther He is thus really and corporeally present in the sacrament.

When considering the person of Christ and His personal union, Zwingli denied the communication of attributes. His solution to the problem of the interaction of the two natures in Christ is found in his term "alloiosis." Thus when the Bible speaks of one nature of Christ, it uses the terms which belong to another. Zwingli referred to the various "figures of speech, called in the Greek, tropos, that is metaphorical, or to be understood in another sense."[3] He was accustomed to refer to passages such as John 15: "I am the vine," or John 6: "I am the living bread," where Jesus used a form of speech.

The doctrine of the person of Christ came into controversy because it was most intimately connected with the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The sacramental system of

---

[3]Huldreich Zwingli, On the Lord's Supper, February 23, 1526 in Library of Christian Classics, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Philadelphia, 1953), XXIV, 223.

the reformers was based upon their view of Christ. The nature of the person of Christ was thus of paramount importance for them.

It will thus be seen that Johann Brenz in the controversy of the sixteenth century had to concern himself with the study of this important doctrine. There are extant a number of his works entitled, "Concerning the Personal Union."[4]

## The Session of Christ

Exactly where is Christ right now?" asked the church in the Reformation. If He is in heaven, He cannot be in the sacrament. If He is everywhere, He must also be in the sacrament. These were the views held by the two schools of thought on the matter.

The former position centers its attention upon the words of the Apostles' Creed, "He ascended into heaven and sits at the right hand of God." The latter position, which was held by Brenz and Luther, claimed that Jesus Christ was omnipresent and therefore present wherever and whenever He wished. The Zwinglians, using rational arguments,

---

[4]Köhler, Brentiana, 385, De Personali Unione Duarum Naturarum In Christo, Et Ascensu Christi In Coelum, Ac Sessione Eius Ad Dextram Dei Patris. See also 420 with the same title produced several years later.

held to the former position and stated that Christ was locally present in heaven and thus could not really be present in the sacrament.

An attendant question to the issue of the session, or the aseity of Christ, concerns the definition of the term, "right hand of God." For some of the Zwinglians this meant a very local existence, in heaven and remote from the world, from which place He would come again to "judge both the quick and the dead." The Lutherans held that the term referred to the symbol of Christ's power in a figurative sense as the right hand is used as a general symbol of power.

Thus the area of difference between Brenz and the Lutherans with Zwingli, Bullinger, and the other Reformed leaders centered about three points: Where was Christ bodily now? What does it mean to sit at the right hand of God? What has this to do with the sacrament? These became issues in the controversy as we shall see.

## The Use of John, Chapter Six

There were a great number of Bible passages often alluded to or quoted by the reformers of the sixteenth century. Many of them were used again and again in a monotonous repetition. They were invoked to reinforce certain positions or teachings. About the meaning of them

there was often violent disagreement. The major example is found in John, Chapter 6. The section that caused so much controversy was verses 48-58:

> I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven; If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said to them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up on the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live forever.

Still later the controversy settled upon part of verse 63, "the flesh profiteth nothing."

There had been a question in the early church concerning this passage, whether or not it applied to the sacrament. Sasse has shown that Augustine used it to refer to the sacrament.[5] He also has shown that Augustine did not apply it in the same sense as did the Zwinglians in the sixteenth century.

---

[5]Hermann Sasse, <u>This Is My Body</u> (Minneapolis, 1959), p. 30.

Luther, in two of his works on the sacrament, Das Grosse Bekenntnis vom Abentmahl (The Great Confession on the Lord's Supper) and The Babylonian Captivity of the Church, held that the sixth chapter of John does not say a single word about the sacrament. In his Sermons on the Gospel of John, Chapters Six to Eight, he calls them "Sacramentarians and schismatic spirits who pounce upon this word 'flesh.' They get stuck on this word and exclaim, 'Flesh, flesh.'"[6] Luther held that Jesus really meant it when He said, "I am placing flesh and blood before you; eat and drink, that is believe it!"[7] That this passage was to be taken as a reference to faith in Christ and not to a literal eating and drinking Luther showed in 1527: "When we eat the flesh of Christ, physically and spiritually, this food is so strong that it transforms us into itself and changes carnal, sinful, mortal men into men who are holy and alive."[8] The sacrament does this for men, yet faith does the same thing since by faith Christ comes to men.

Zwingli and Oecolampadius both relied on John 6 and

---

[6]Martin Luther, Luther's Works, trans. Martin H. Bertram (St. Louis, 1959), XXIII, 119.

[7]Ibid., p. 122.

[8]Martin Luther, This Is My Body, W. A., XXIII, 205.

held that Christ alluded to a spiritual feeding and they declared that "the flesh profiteth nothing." This was the key verse for them for they used it to justify their own rejection of a corporal eating in the Supper. Luther rejected their interpretation and held that the verse does not apply to the sacrament at all, but to the fact that a man's body does not profit him anything. Zwingli and Luther were close together in the interpretation of the first part of this chapter since neither believed that it dealt with communion. Zwingli, however, was inclined to take verses 52 and 63 together: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?... and the flesh profiteth nothing." Luther replied that this could not mean that the real presence of the body and blood of Christ did not benefit the communicant for the word "flesh" here is not the same as "body." Christ was here speaking of a spiritual eating of His flesh.[9]

There was a difference among Calvin, Luther, and Zwingli on John 6. Calvin considered verse 55 as being a reference to the sacrament - "For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed," for he said,

> If these words are not to go for nothing, it follows that in order to have our life in Christ, our souls

---

[9]Martin Luther, Das Grosse Bekenntnis vom Abentmahl, W. A., XXVI, 372.

> must feed on his body and blood as their proper food. This, then, is expressly attested in the Supper, when of the bread it is said to us that we are to take it and eat it, and that it is his body, and of the cup to drink it, and that it is his blood. This is expressly spoken of the body and the blood, in order that we may learn to seek there the substance of our spiritual life.[10]

Calvin here used a section of the chapter for the support of his position on the Lord's Supper, Zwingli used sections also to support himself, and Luther denied that it had any application to the sacrament.

Brenz had entered the discussion early after the publication of Oecolampadius' Wahre und ächte Erklärung der Worte des Herrn: das ist mein Leib (A True and Careful Explanation of the Words of the Lord: This Is My Body) in September, 1525. The Basel professor had dedicated it to the Swabians in the hope that they might be gained for his position and desert Luther. Brenz replied and attacked his position on John 6. The Syngramma Suevicum contained his answer to Oecolampadius. On John 6 he supported Luther, saying that "by faith the faithful eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood when they believe."[11] A month

---

[10]John Calvin, Short Treatises on the Holy Supper of Our Lord Jesus Christ in Tracts and Treatises on the Doctrine and Worship of the Church, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids, 1958), II, 170.

[11]Köhler, Brentiana, 13, page facing 19. Syngramma Clarissimorum qui Halae Suevorum convenerunt virorum, super verbis Coenae Dominicae ... Ad Oecolampadion.

later he reiterated his position to Dietrich von Gemmingen:

> The Word has the body, the Word brings the body to the bread, and as we eat the Word, so we eat the body. The Word will be spiritually eaten, thus one must eat the body spiritually.[12]

In his Commentary on St. John of 1527 Brenz argues that the giver of the body is Christ, that it is given by preaching and the sacrament gives it by faith.[13]

Otto Fricke has examined the views of Brenz on this chapter and concludes in his study of Brenz's argument from the time of the patriarchs until Paul:

> The patriarchs were holy ... they drank of the spiritual rock which followed them; the rock was Jesus Christ. If they had not eaten his flesh and drunk his blood, that means, if they had not believed on Christ, then they would never have been justified.[14]

The flesh of Christ is brought through the Word, just as the Holy Spirit or the forgiveness of sins is brought through the Word of God. Of verse 63 it is held by Brenz that the flesh of itself has no usefulness to man; but if the spirit of God comes to the flesh, then it is very useful.[15] Köhler has found thirty-four theses based upon

---

[12] T. P., 15, p. 5. "Word" here means Christ as in John 1:1.

[13] Köhler, Brentiana, 22.

[14] Op. cit., p. 49.

[15] Ibid., p. 48.

John 6 that are ascribed to Brenz.[16]

Brenz, in Ein kurzer und klarer Bericht von beiden Sakramenten (A Brief and Clear Commentary on Both Sacraments) teaches that in verse 63, "the flesh is not useful," Jesus does not say, "my flesh is not useful, but rather, the flesh is not useful."[17] He summarized his opposition:

> They say: The details of the speech of Christ are given, that he speaks of eating his flesh, for he had said before: If you do not eat the flesh of the Son of man, etc.
>
> Answer: This has the appearance of truth ... but it seems a contradiction against the first speech in verse 52. Also the Word in other places, if it does not speak of the flesh of Christ here as my flesh or the flesh of the Son of man, the Word, when looking forward to flesh and spirit in this connection, has never meant the flesh of Christ as I Timothy 3:16 points out: it means the flesh of men in the world.[18]

It is evident that this chapter played a major role in the Sacramentarian Controversy since there was no definite and certain interpretation of the meaning of the text. It is considered here in detail to set the frame of reference for the controversy itself. The passage will often be alluded to in the discussions by Brenz.

---

[16] Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, "Brentiana und andere Reformatoria," II (1912), p. 129.

[17] Ibid., p. 139.

[18] Ibid.

## The Doctrine of the Ubiquity

It is difficult to say exactly when the concept of the "ubiquity" came into general use, although it had its source in medieval thought.[19] Preserved Smith attributes it to Scotus and credits Pirkheimer with the first use of the term in the Reformation era.[20] One can say for certain that Brenz's ideas on the concept were not new and he himself did not describe his teaching on the sacrament by this term. In the controversy over the Lord's Supper it arose as a word of derision when the Zwinglians applied it to the teachings of Luther and Brenz on the Eucharist.

Pelikan holds that "Luther's exegesis [on the words of institution] was impossible without the acceptance of a particular theory of physis current in the late Middle Ages, with its unique interpretation of space, mass, volume, motion, and the like."[21] Luther held to this theory at Marburg and even later in his discussions on the sacrament.

---

[19]A. W. Huntzinger, "Ubiquity," The New Schaff-Herzog, op. cit., XII, 51-54 contains a study of the term through the development of the Formula of Concord.

[20]Preserved Smith and Charles Jacobs, eds. and trans., Luther's Correspondence and other Contemporary Letters (Philadelphia, 1918), p. 366, n. 4.

[21]Martin Luther, Luther's Works, trans. J. Pelikan (St. Louis, 1959), 56, 141.

Köstlin believed that "Luther persisted in refusing to regard that Body [of Christ] as one involving limits. The Body here was not local or circumscribed by bounds."[22] Lindsay also cites Luther at Marburg as one "who insisted more and more on the necessity of the presence in the elements of the Body of Christ 'corporeally extended in space'; while Carlstadt denied that presence in any sense whatsoever."[23]

Luther's concept of the ubiquity of the body of Christ according to His human nature by virtue of the personal union of the natures persisted in his writings during his lifetime. He was not always so certain about it in later life but never denied it. His heir was Brenz and the term fell upon his teachings on the Lord's Supper.

The term came into general usage again after the death of Luther and the beginning of the controversies over the sacrament. Brenz's doctrine was not a novel dogma for he was really repeating Luther and previous theologians.

What is meant by the term as scholars have applied it to Brenz and Luther? Perhaps it can be best summarized by saying that the whole human-divine Christ is present with

---

[22]Julius Köstlin, Life of Luther (New York, 1920), p. 395.

[23]Thomas M. Lindsay, A History of the Reformation (New York, 1906), p. 356.

His church to the end of time. Reformed theologians had predicated of the body of Christ only a local and a visible presence while Brenz and the Lutherans pointed to Scripture as ascribing to the Son of Man not only a local, but also an illocal and a peculiarly divine presence. To substantiate the first of the three modes of existence that Brenz held, he turned to John 4:4, "And Jesus must pass through Samaria," to prove His local existence on the earth. To show the illocal presence of Christ, Brenz quoted John 20:19, "When therefore it was evening, the first day of the week, and when the doors were shut where the disciples were, for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be with you." The third or divine presence was substantiated by Ephesians 4:10, "He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all heavens, that he might fill all things." Luther had also taught this three-fold mode of existence of the Christ. For Brenz the unity of the humanity and the divinity in the personal union of Christ was interpreted to imply an absolute omnipresence of the body of Christ even after His resurrection and ascension. This was to be understood as being true from the moment of the incarnation of the divine Logos or Christ, not from the moment of ascension, as the Swiss taught.

Thus it meant for Brenz that the bread as bread was

eaten by the mouth, but the body was administered along with the blood by the Word in the bread and the wine. The terms "in, with, and under" were developed by the Lutherans to describe this phenomenon of the presence of the total Christ in the sacrament. The concept of the ubiquity was not a Lutheran term, but the Zwinglians made it an albatross in the Sacramentarian Controversy.

## Worthy and Unworthy Communicants

The passage of Holy Scripture that caused the greatest amount of conflict in the early history of the controversy over the Lord's Supper was John 6. Toward the end of the century the attention shifted to I Corinthians 11. The first passage might illustrate the differences in interpretation between Lutherans and Zwinglians and the latter between Lutherans and Calvinists.

In the Corinthians passage Paul says in verses 28-29:

> Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.

Brenz and Luther from the earliest Reformation times taught that both the worthy and the unworthy individuals received the body and the blood in the sacrament. Brenz as early as 1526, in referring to the words of institution,

states that "hereupon the bread and wine was divided to everyone and his body and blood are given for the forgiveness of sins and it is received by all."[24] The following year he also wrote on the same matter, saying, "the unbeliever receives the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper which are the body and blood of Christ, but because he does not believe, he receives it not for usefulness but for judgment upon himself."[25]

The controversy began early over the passage but did not reach major proportions until late in the century. Luther, already in 1529, had met Zwingli at Marburg and the passage was discussed. It was not, however, the great issue that John 6 was at that time. Luther muses:

> Dear God, should it be such a hard thing to believe that a godless man may receive the body and blood of Christ, when they must believe that the devil led Christ directly into the temple and the high mountain, and afterwards the Jews seized and crucified him?[26]

In the Large Catechism Luther says, "the treasure, indeed, is opened and placed at everyone's door ... but it is necessary that you claim it."[27]

---

[24]Johann Brenz, Haltung des Abentmals Christi, December 25, 1526.

[25]Johann Brenz, Letter to Reuttingensis, April 13, 1527.

[26]Martin Luther, Vermahnung zum Sakrament, Walch, XVII, 1976.

[27]Triglotta, p. 761.

The issue of worthiness was not such a great problem for Zwingli who chose to ignore the implications of this passage and rather centered his attention only upon the memorial aspect of the Supper. Calvin felt that grace was limited and not intended for all. He, therefore, held that only the believers and the worthy elect received the body and blood spiritually in the sacrament. The admonition and warning of Paul was considered by Calvin as a warning to those who participated in the Sacrament and were not of the elect. They were condemned already by his concept of limited grace.

Luther and Brenz had a high regard for this passage and considered the admonition to examination to be an important feature in the sacrament. Since the Supper is received by all men and the body and blood also, it is necessary that all men examine themselves before coming to the Lord's Table. The Lutherans emphasized the necessity of faith before coming to the Holy Communion.

Calvin broadly denied that unbelievers could ever receive the body and blood of the Lord in the sacrament. He turned to I Corinthians 10:21 - "Ye cannot drink of the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and the table of devils."[28]

---

[28]Walther Köhler, "Brentiana et andere Reformatoria II," Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, IX (1912), pp. 128-129.

Brenz and the Lutherans answered from the context of this passage that Paul was saying that you must be either of the party of God or of the devil and that this passage does not directly concern itself with the essence of the Holy Supper. The controversy over the reception of the sacrament by the believer and unbeliever was never settled between the Lutheran and Calvinistic parties.

## Medieval Views of the Sacrament

From the very earliest times in the history of the Christian Church, theologians had sought for an adequate answer to the theological issues that were dealt with by Brenz and the other reformers. Scholars had agreed with the words of institution of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and I Corinthians that Christ was present in the sacrament; but the mechanics of His presence were not established. This is not to say that before 1517 the differences over the presence of Christ in the sacrament were constantly in dispute. It was generally agreed that one did not speculate on the sacrament, but rather participated in it.

St. Augustine had early stressed within the Western Church some views relative to the sacrament which later were to influence Luther, an Augustinian. The Eastern Church at first followed Origen and tended to view the sacrament more symbolically. It is to be said that these

views found adherents over the centuries, but by the end of the fifteenth century there was no unanimity in either branch of the church.

There is, however, very little controversy about the sacraments before the middle of the medieval period of history. The first instance of an official opinion on the Lord's Supper in the Eastern Church is found at the Synod of Nicea II of 787. This was during the time of the Iconoclastic Controversy over the use of images within the church. At this Synod it was held that other images of Christ could be used in the church in addition to the elements of the sacrament. John of Damascus in the eighth century also left us a picture of early eastern ideas on the presence of Christ in the sacrament.[29] The Eastern Church at that time and even into the present had no definite doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The liturgy simply states, "make this bread the precious body of Christ ... and the contents of this chalice the precious blood of Thy Christ, changing them through Thy Holy Spirit."[30] The schism

---

[29]J. P. Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus, Series Graeca (Paris, 1857-1904), 94, 1144. "We know nothing more than that the Word of God is true, effective, and almighty, but the 'how' is past finding out." John's position found favor with the Zwinglians and they were wont to quote him in support of their position on the sacrament.

[30]Quoted in Hermann Sasse, op. cit., p. 15.

between Eastern and Western Churches came in 1054 over the "filioque" and not on sacramental issues. The Western Church went on to doctrinal formulations on the sacrament and the Eastern Church's formula remained in its simple dogmatic statement.

Hermann Sasse has summarized the growth of the Western position on the sacrament under "three short decisions (a) in 'Ego Berengarius' of 1079, (b) in the 'Caput Firmiter,' the creed of 1215, and (c) in the decision communio sub una of the Council of Constance in 1415."[31] The final codification of the sacrament for the Roman Church came from the Council of Trent.

It is clear that the Roman Church in the medieval period believed in the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Holy Sacrament and answered the question of "how" with the doctrine of transubstantiation. Paschius Radbertus wrote his book De corpore et sanguine Christi (Concerning the Body and Blood of Christ) in 831 supporting the concept of a change of the substances in the sacrament. In 841 Ratramnus published his work under the same title which held for the presence of Christ in the sacrament, but not through a change in the substance. These two works caused a serious discussion within the church in the ninth

---

[31] Ibid., p. 18.

century, but it never reached the point of a widespread controversy since both were within the doctrinal scope and terminology of the age. These concepts can be traced to sources in either the work of Ambrose of Milan or Augustine of Hippo. The former was the proponent of the view which has come to be called "realism" in the sacrament and the latter held to a spiritualization of the sacrament. From these come the concepts of being "really present" or "spiritually present."

Berengarius in 1059 was the promoter of a spiritual view of the sacrament after the manner of Augustine. His arguments were later used by Zwingli in denying the real presence since Christ was in heaven by virtue of His ascension. In 1079 the dogma "Ego Berengarius" was forced upon him by Nicholas II and the Hildebrandine reformers at a church council, to the effect

> that bread and wine ... through the mystery of the sacred prayer and by the words of the Redeemer are substantially converted into the proper and life-giving flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that, after the consecration, they are the true body of Christ which was born of the Virgin Mary and hung on the cross for the salvation of the world and which now sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and the true blood of Christ which was shed from His side, not only as a sign and by virtue of the sacrament, but in their proper nature and true substance.[32]

---

[32]Giovanni Domenico Mansi, Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio (Paris, 1901-1927), xx, 524.

The doctrine of transubstantiation became the official dogma of the Western Church in 1215 at the Fourth Lateran Council in the statement, "Caput Firmiter" (Established Principle). Here we read:

> There is one universal church of the faithful, outside of which no one is saved. In this church Jesus Christ Himself is priest and sacrifice, whose body and blood are truly contained in the Sacrament of the Altar under the species of bread and wine, the body having been transubstantiated into the body, and the wine into the blood by divine power.[33]

The decision reflects the power of that greatest of all medieval popes, Innocent III.

The doctrine became even more exact in the sixteenth century decree of the Council of Trent:

> By the consecration of the bread and wine a change is brought about of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood. This change the holy Catholic Church properly and appropriately calls transubstantiation.[34]

The doctrine of communion in one kind was stated by the Council of Constance in 1415. This pronouncement can be traced to the influence of Thomas Aquinas in the Roman Church. He made a distinction between the "accidents" and the "substances" and thus made it possible to answer

---

[33] Ibid., xxii, 982.

[34] H. J. Schroeder, Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent (St. Louis, 1940), Session XIII, IV, 75.

the question of what is changed by the words of consecration and what is not. This doctrine teaches that at the moment of consecration the elements are changed into the body and blood of Christ, but still have the outward form of bread and wine. The substances of bread and wine now have the "accidents" of body and blood. By the "unbloody" sacrifice of the mass the body and blood are now present. The doctrine of concomitance is here used for the bread has now become the body of Christ and within itself it also contains the blood of Christ. Thus in communion under one kind the communicant receives both the body and blood in one wafer. The entire Christ is in the sacrament and is present in either of the elements.

This brief historical section has been designed to point up the problem of the Eucharist in the history of the early church during the medieval period. It brings one quickly to the Reformation period. It is enough to see that the Roman Church at the time of the Reformation had attempted several answers to the question of "how" Christ is present in the sacrament and had codified its position save for the final statements of Trent.

It could be said that all the controversies about the Lord's Supper of the sixteenth century between Protestants and the Roman Church and between each of the reform movements of that century were previsioned in the

medieval church from the ninth through the fifteenth centuries. The difference between the church of the West before 1517 and afterwards is to be found in a certain frame of reference. Before the Reformation period doctrinal questions were settled by a central church authority vested in either a strong pope or in a council of the church. The movement of the Renaissance brought into being a new sense of freedom of thought in the spirit of which the reformers of the Reformation era denied the central authority and the doctrinal differences became controversial. In this regard one can see the strength of Luther in his insistent call for a general council of the church to solve its problems. Even after one had been called, perhaps too late to heal the sacramental wounds of the church, Brenz and others prepared documents to present there and even went boldly to Trent expecting to be heard.

From what has been stated, it is obvious that all aspects of the question concerning the Lord's Supper here posed continued to trouble the Reformation churches. Theologians of the medieval church were already familiar with the doctrines of the ubiquity, the union of the two natures in Christ, the real presence, the session of Christ at the right hand of God, and the eating and drinking by worthy and unworthy communicants. The answers to these pressing problems of the sixteenth century can be seen in a study

of the views of various reformers and the role that Brenz played in the Sacramentarian Controversy.

## Sacramental Views of the Sixteenth-Century Reformers

Brenz, along with Luther, held that a study of Christology is important for the development of any theological position relative to the sacrament. They both held this to be true for the early Christian Church and also for the church of their own century. All the reformers were drawn into a consideration of the person of Christ in order to gain a systematic approach to sacramental theology. One needed to consider the questions concerning the person of Christ and His present place, and, therefore, to study the sacrament in the light of Christology to answer if Christ could be in the elements and how.

As we have seen, there were many answers to the question, "How is Christ present in the sacrament?" To understand Brenz's role in the Sacramentarian Controversy, it is necessary to note the representative statements of various reformers who were his contemporaries.

It was inevitable that the medieval ideas of the church would have a direct bearing on this doctrine. Dr. George Forell says that

> the Lutheran position in regard to the Lord's Supper is so completely dependent upon Christology that it cannot be understood apart from two scholastic

> concepts in regard to the person of Christ. The one concept is the so-called communicatio idiomatum (communication of attributes), and the other the "ubiquity" of Christ.[35]

Cyril Richardson has observed the influence of the medieval ideas on the sacraments on all the reformers, stating that

> there are two bases upon which the medieval sacramental system rested: (a) that the Christian can participate in the substance of the body of Christ, and (b) that the consecrated elements bear an essential relation to this substance. Luther, true to the medieval view, affirmed both of the positions; Calvin adopted a mediating view, affirming (a) and denying (b) ... while Zwingli denied both (a) and (b).[36]

It is evident that on the question of the sacrament began "that division of opinion among the ranks of the Evangelical Reformers [on the sacrament], which served more than anything else to retard the fresh and vigorous progress of the Reformation."[37]

The most widely circulated teachings on the sacrament were those of Carlstadt, Zwingli, Calvin, Luther, and Brenz. The doctrine of Carlstadt everyone seems to have rejected with unanimity. Carlstadt presented his theory by stating, "I have always explained it thus that Christ pointed to

---

[35]"The Lord's Supper and Christology," Lutheran Church Quarterly, 18 (1945), p. 92.

[36]C. C. Richardson, Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist (Evanston, 1949), p. 11.

[37]Köstlin, op. cit., p. 340.

his body when he said, 'This is my body.'"[38] None of the other men seriously thought of this as a possible interpretation of the words of institution.

Zwingli and his successors at Geneva generally held to a position which might be summarized as "that which I give you is the sign of my body (signum corporis) -- Panis est symbolon sive signum corporis Christi." Here Zwingli takes the verb "is" of the words of institution in the sense of "signify" (significat) and adduces passages to show its use elsewhere in the Bible in this sense. Brenz followed Luther and adopted the dogma of the real presence which stated that Christ is really present since the copulative "is" is a verb of being and Christ is really present, for "no man can ever prove that in a single passage of Scripture, indeed in all the languages of the world, 'is' means as much as 'signifies.'"[39] These are the positions to which these men came in their attempts to explain "how" Christ is present in the sacrament.

How did they come to these teachings? Zwingli would have nothing to do with the doctrine of the real presence of the body or the ubiquity. He "conceives of Christ's risen body as a thing, locally resident in heaven, and

---

[38] Luthers Werke, St. Louis edition, XX, 2325.

[39] W. A., XXVI, 268.

having no essential relation to the Christian believer."[40] "For Zwingli the Lord's Supper has a two-fold significance. It is a thanksgiving festival (Eucharista) for grace already received, and a means whereby the Church's unity is given expression (synaxis)."[41] The words, "this is my body," simply meant to Zwingli, "this represents my body." He opposed the literal interpretation of the words of institution. Thus he held that "if God says literally: 'This is my body,' then the body ought to be there literally and corporeally, just as the light was there literally when he commanded it to be so."[42] His doctrine was attacked even in his own Zurich for Joachim am Gruet advocated the real presence of the ascended body of Christ, a position much like that of Brenz and Luther. Zwingli's life was short and the development of his dogma was then committed to Bullinger and others.

Calvin's position on the Lord's Supper as a sacrament can be seen in his Catechism of Geneva of 1541 where he defines a sacrament as "an outward attestation of the divine benevolence toward us, which represents spiritual grace symbolically, to seal the promises of God in our hearts,

---

[40]C. C. Richardson, op. cit., p. 12.

[41]Ibid., p. 13.

[42]Huldreich Zwingli, On the Lord's Supper in Library of Christian Classics, op. cit., XXIV, p. 191.

by which the truth is better confirmed."[43] This is a sacrament, but how is Christ to be present in the Lord's Supper?

> The tract gives us the true doctrine of Calvin on the Supper: "He gives us by the action of the Holy Spirit a true explanation of the proper substance of the body and blood of Christ. It is a spiritual participation, that which signifies a participation which is the work of the Spirit." We note that Calvin does not speak of a spiritual presence, but rather of a spiritual participation.
>
> How the bread and wine are called body and blood: We have already begun to enter into this question, so debated both in old times and at the present time, to know how these words ought to be comprehended where the bread is called the body of the Lord and the wine his blood. This question ought to be resolved without great difficulty if we hold ... that all the usefulness that we ought to find in the sacrament is destroyed, if Jesus Christ is not given to us as the reality and foundation of everything.[44]

The bread and the wine in the sacrament are for Calvin the sign of the substance and the reality of the presence of Christ in a spiritual fashion. He says clearly, "I differ widely from those who dream of a corporeal eating."[45] He thus placed himself against the doctrine of the real presence as enunciated by Brenz and Luther.

Although Luther taught the doctrine of the real presence,

---

[43] Ibid., XXII, 131.

[44] Jean Calvin, Petit traite de la Sainte Cene (Paris, 1959), pp. 12, 24-25 of the Introduction by Jean Cadier.

[45] Library of Christian Classics, op. cit., XXII, 290.

he tended to accept the ubiquity as an answer to the question of how Christ is present in the Holy Supper. Pelikan has pointed this out and has called attention to the Reformer's dependence upon the scholastics:

> Luther set for his semi-exegetical and semi-speculative doctrine ... the "ubiquity" of the body of Christ. The basis for this doctrine was a distinction ... taken over, as Luther freely admitted, from the scholastic philosophers ... between three modes of presence: the ordinary "local" mode, the "definitive" mode characteristic of the angels; and the "repletive" mode more characteristic of God.... Christ's body likewise had three modes of being present everywhere: the comprehensible and physical; the incomprehensible and spiritual; and the heavenly.[46]

At other times Luther referred more specifically to one or another mode of the presence of Christ as he does when he says, "Christ's body must be at one place bodily and palpably, as a peasant is in his coat and trousers, since it only has a local and visible presence."[47] In his early works it is hard to determine exactly what his doctrine of the sacrament really was, whether he then taught the ubiquity of the body of Christ. It seems as though he did, but that he did not try to explain it. In the Babylonian Captivity of the Church of 1520 he presents the dilemma of the presence and shows that it is a matter of

---

[46]Martin Luther, Luther's Works, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (St. Louis, 1959), 56, 139. See also above, pages 49 and 50.

[47]Luthers Werke, St. Louis edition, XX, 950.

faith for the Christian:

> For my part, if I cannot fathom how the bread is the body of Christ, I will take my reason captive to the obedience of Christ, and simply clinging to His Word, firmly believe that not only the body of Christ is in the bread, but that the bread is the body of Christ.[48]

In the first few years after 1517, Luther still believed in and taught transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass.[49] His doctrine of the sacrament obviously was still developing as the need to understand and amplify it appeared.

Brenz's ideas on the sacrament came entirely from Luther. Otto Fricke reminds us that "Johann Brenz is not Luther,"[50] but that he certainly slavishly followed him in doctrine and practice. Throughout the entire controversy over the Lord's Supper, he staunchly maintained the doctrine which he believed Luther had always taught. His determined stand was responsible for the length of the controversy over the sacrament and helped center much of the attack upon himself.

It is evident that the reformers of the sixteenth

---

[48]A. J. Holman, ed., Works of Martin Luther (Philadelphia, 1916), trans. A. T. W. Steinhaeuser, p. 193.

[49]In 1519 in "Ein Sermon von den hochwürdigen Sacrament des Leichnams Christi" and in 1520 in a sermon on the Mass.

[50]Otto Fricke, op. cit., p. vi.

century depended to a large extent upon the concepts of the medieval church for their doctrines relative to the sacrament. As we have seen, all had a strong Christological interest, but they did not all reach the same conclusions relative to Christ and His presence in the sacrament. The inevitable result was the Sacramentarian Controversy which persisted throughout the major part of the Reformation century. Brenz was a key figure in it.

## CHAPTER THREE

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CONTROVERSY

Given the theological, political, and personal backgrounds of the various reformers it would seem almost inevitable that controversy would arise among them. While there were numerous differences that caused friction, the most important were those concerning the Lord's Supper, which became the symbol of the theological strife. Luther, a monk-theological of Wittenberg in northern Germany, who enjoyed the protection of an Elector of the Holy Roman Empire; Zwingli, a Swiss humanist, laboring under the protection of a city council; Bucer, a controversialist from Strassburg, whose work was most often directed toward unity; and Brenz, a staunch defender of truth as he saw it, who enjoyed the favor of a controversial duke, were several of the men who came to fill the pages of the Sacramentarian Controversy. Add to this a pair of second generation reformers: John Calvin, a systematician in control of a major Swiss city; and Heinrich Bullinger, the erstwhile successor to Zwingli, and one has the full panoply of men and views that dominated the controversy.

The spark that ignited the controversy was a work by Cornelius Hoen of the Hague. An associate of his, Hinne

Rode, brought a copy of his Epistle on the Eucharist to Wittenberg about 1521.[1] This was while Luther was at the Wartburg after the Diet of Worms. It seems to have had a pronounced influence on the easily-persuaded Carlstadt. Hoen argued for a figurative and symbolic interpretation of the words of institution. Luther returned in haste on March 6, 1522, and the controversy with Carlstadt began. The Wittenbergers, even though they did not as yet fully understand or completely support Luther's position, agreed to the removal of Carlstadt from their midst. Equally unwelcome at Strassburg because of his Auslegung dieser Wort Christi (Exposition of These Words of Christ)[2] of 1524, Carlstadt moved on from that city.

Hinne Rode brought Hoen's work to the Swiss cities of Basel and Zurich, and to Strassburg. He was warmly received by Oecolampadius, Zwingli, and Bucer. Zwingli, after adding a commentary of his own, had Hoen's book printed. Although Bucer was more cautious, he was willing to concede the feasibility of this sacramental position.

One is forced to agree with Tillmanns that "the fight began inauspiciously. Brenz had championed the doctrine

---

[1]John T. McNeill, Unitive Protestantism (Richmond, 1964), p. 137.

[2]Hermann Barge, Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt (Leipzig, 1905), II, 168-177.

of the Real Presence, while Luther up to this time had been non-committal.... Bugenhagen had become involved, defending Brenz's position."[3]

The polemics began with Luther firing a broadside at both Carlstadt and those who held the symbolical presence in his Wider die himmlischen Propheten (Against the Heavenly Prophets) of January, 1525.[4] Zwingli, not one to remain silent, answered with De Vera et Falsa Religione (Of True and False Religion) in March of the same year.[5] Both supported their views on the Supper and the controversy centered about the use of the word "is" from the words of institution.

Brenz, as we have seen, took it upon himself to support Luther against Oecolampadius. The latter had produced in this first year of the controversy his Wahre und Rechte Erklärung der Worte des Herrn: das ist mein Leib,[6] a support for the Zwinglian position from the reformer of Weinsberg. Brenz rallied his Swabian friends to join him in the issuing of the Syngramma in 1526. This attack on Oecolampadius was

---

[3]Walter G. Tillmanns, The World and Men Around Luther (Minneapolis, 1959), p. 320.

[4]W. A., XVIII (37), 62-125.

[5]Huldreich Zwingli, The Latin Works of Huldreich Zwingli, trans. Samuel Macauley Jackson (Philadelphia, 1929), III, pp. 1-337. See the material on the sacrament on pp. 197-253.

[6]K. R. Hagenbach, Johann Oekolampad und Oswald Myconias: Leben und ausgewählte Schriften (Elberfeld, 1859), pp. 240-243.

made in spite of Bucer's pleas to Brenz to remain outside the controversy. It also represents for Brenz a sharp reappraisal of his attitude toward his former friend and teacher.[7] The Syngramma contained "a sharp and clear expression against the Swiss on the bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament."[8] Brenz reacted unfavorably to the pressure that Bucer was trying to put on him to suppress any answer to Oecolampadius' first work. Brenz wrote two letters[9] that attacked Bucer for he "did not teach that the bread of the supper ... is really the true body of Christ."[10]

Bucer and Oecolampadius felt obligated to reply to Brenz. Oecolampadius reiterated his position on the sacrament and opposed Brenz before his fellow clergy in Antisyngramma ad Ecclesiastes Suevos.[11] Bucer entered the polemics with his Apologia Martini Buceri, dated March 8, 1526.[12] He opposed Brenz and brought up in his work the matter of worthy and unworthy communicants.

---

[7]T. P., 8 (II) has an invitation of June 27, 1524 from Brenz to Oecolampadius urging him to come to Swabia for a discussion on the sacramental issue.

[8]Alfred Brecht, op. cit., p. 23.

[9]T. P., 13, 14.

[10]Ibid., 14 on October 21, 1525.

[11]Known also as the Billiche Antwort or Reasonable Reply.

[12]Martin Butzer, Apologia Martini Butzer (Strassburg, 1526), 36 pages.

In a letter to Adam Weiss of November 27, 1527, he also attacked the contention of the Zwinglians that the Lord's Supper is a "symbolon, for the body and blood of the true Christ are presented to us by His words of institution."[13] This was not new to Brenz for in the Syngramma he had already held that "we assert that we eat the body of Christ physically."[14]

Brenz interjected into the controversy his interpretation of John 6 in his commentary on that book in 1527.[15] The following year Bucer answered Brenz with his own commentary on John, which so angered Brenz that the two men were never again able to maintain a close friendship. The suspicions that Brenz and other Lutherans had with respect to Bucer's views had been corroborated by some of his translations of Lutheran materials. In October, 1526, he had translated a series of Luther's sermons and had added the Preface of Martin Bucer to Four Books of Lutheran Sermons,[16] in which the Germans found Zwinglian ideas. He had also translated and edited Bugenhagen's Psalter, taking the liberty

---

[13] T. P., 29.

[14] Luthers Werke, St. Louis edition, XX, Col. 564, 4.

[15] Köhler, Brentiana, 22.

[16] Martin Bucer, Opera Latina, ed. Francois Wendel (Gütersloh, 1955), Praefatio M. Buceri in quartem tomum Postillae Lutheranae.

of changing the interpretation of Psalm 111:5 into a defense of the Zwinglian position on the Lord's Supper.[17] Of course, none of this pleased Brenz or the other supporters of Luther.

The political situation within the Empire was becoming serious for the German Reformation parties. The first Diet of Speyer of 1526 had granted to the Lutherans some freedom to continue their work. The Recess had specified that the church should act "as it would if it had to answer only to God and the emperor." Along with a growing religious interest in Germany, there was also a growing military concern as the Catholic League was organized by Duke George of Saxony and Henry of Brunswick, while the Lutheran League of Gotha was formed by the combined efforts of Philip of Hesse, John of Saxony, and Henry of Mecklenburg.

In 1528 Brenz turned his attention to the spread of Lutheran influence through his catechism. On the sacrament, it stated,

> What is the Lord's Supper?
> It is a spiritual feast wherein are communicated to us spiritual food and drink.
>
> Why do you term it spiritual food and drink?
> For indeed bread and wine, that are partaken of at the Lord's Supper, are corporeal food and drink.
>
> So they would be judged according to corporeal taste, but meanwhile our Lord Jesus Christ has blessed and

---

[17] Walther Köhler, Zwingli und Luther (Leipzig, 1953), I, 354.

> instituted the bread of the Lord's Supper as His true body, and the wine as His true blood, through His divine Word, so that the Lord's Supper shall be not a food for the body unto satiety, but a food for the soul unto the preservation of the spiritual virtues communicated to us through Baptism and received through the Creed. Hence it is rightly named a spiritual food and drink.[18]

The year 1529 was a significant one for the development of the Lutheran Reformation and also for the position of Brenz as one of the leaders of the Reformation. The second Diet of Speyer had met and repealed the Recess of 1526. Now Roman Catholic teaching was permitted in Lutheran areas, but there was no reciprocal arrangement. This was to remain in effect until the elusive general council of the church could be held to resolve the issues of the Lutheran Reformation. It was at this meeting in Speyer on April 19, 1529, that six princes and fourteen cities signed the "Protest."

Philip of Hesse, sensing that the religious problem was equally as critical as the military problem, was anxious to get the reform movements into some sort of agreement with one another. Realizing that the major issue was over the Lord's Supper, he invited the Lutherans and the representatives of the Genevan party, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bucer, Hedio, and Sturm, to Marburg. The meeting took place October 2-5. It is perhaps most noted for Luther's stand on Hoc est

---

[18]Translation by Elbert Vaughn Wills, Lutheran Church Quarterly, July, 1946, p. 279.

meum corpus (This is my body) than for the results obtained. Brenz was also a participant in the discussions there. The parties agreed on fourteen points of doctrine, but could not fully agree on the fifteenth dealing with the Lord's Supper. The final statement on the matter was

> We all believe, with regard to the supper of our blessed Lord Jesus Christ, that it ought to be celebrated in both kinds, according to the institution of Christ; that the mass is not a work by which a Christian obtains pardon for another man, whether dead or alive; that the sacrament of the altar is the very body and blood of Christ Jesus; and that the spiritual manducation of this body and blood is specially necessary to every true Christian. In like manner, as to the use of the sacrament, we are agreed that, like the Word, it was ordained of Almighty God, in order that weak consciences might be excited by the Holy Ghost to faith and charity.
>
> And although at present we are not agreed on the question whether the real body and blood of Christ are corporeally present in the bread and wine, yet both parties shall cherish Christian charity for another, so far as the conscience of each will permit; and both parties will earnestly implore Almighty God to strengthen us by His Spirit in the true understanding. Amen.[19]

This agreement was signed by all the parties at the meeting on October 5, 1529. Each party went home claiming a victory at Marburg.

Brenz wrote three reports on the Marburg Colloquy.[20]

---

[19]Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church (New York, 1882), VI, 646.

[20]T. P., 46, 49, 50. See Walther Köhler, Das Marburger Religionsgespräch (Leipzig, 1929), p. 3.

In one of them he expressed the growing division between the two parties over the real presence in the sacrament. The Zwinglians, he said, wanted the Lutherans as brothers, but because of sacramental differences, "they should be our friends, but not our brothers."[21]

Bucer was determined to continue efforts at mediation, but his role at Marburg had been weakened by the editorial digressions he had made on Lutheran works and also by his action in 1528 when he had joined with Zwingli and Oecolampadius at the Disputation of Bern to defend the thesis, "That the body and blood of Christ are actually and bodily received in the Eucharist, may not be proven from Scripture." At Marburg he had tried to reconcile himself to Brenz and Osiander when he conceded that Christ's body was in the Supper and was given in and through the bread to the believers. He later gave up this position in his varied role as promoter of either one side or the other in the controversy.[22]

The Marburg Colloquy was also deadlocked over the issue of John 6: "the flesh profiteth nothing"; therefore, according to the Zwinglians, the body of Christ was not present; one body cannot be in more than one place at a

---

[21] T. P. 49. Bericht über die Handlung zu Martpurg von dem Sacrament, November, 1529.

[22] W. A., XXX, III, 150.

time. An attendant issue to the controversy, that the administration of the sacrament is effective only for believers, also caused much bitterness.

Marburg stood as mute evidence to the growing problems in the Sacramentarian Controversy. In spite of much agreement between the two parties, the difference with respect to the sacrament continued to broaden the rift between Lutherans and Zwinglians.

After Marburg Brenz and the Württembergers found themselves in close agreement with Luther's position on the presence of Christ in the Supper. They felt they could trust neither the Zwinglians nor Bucer.

Brenz's position on the sacrament to 1530 has been recently investigated by Brecht.[23] He sees four periods in the development of Brenz's thought concerning the Lord's Supper during the period from 1522; his battle against the Roman Mass, his falling out with Oecolampadius over his views, his growing interest in the sacrament on the basis of his commentary on St. John, and his emphasis upon John 6 and the importance of faith in the real presence of Christ in the sacrament. Brenz now had fully accepted the position of Luther on the sacrament and continued to do so in the strife which followed.

---

[23]Martin Brecht, op. cit., pp. 64-111.

Later in the month of October, 1529, Brenz, Luther, Justus Jonas, and Agricola met, probably at Schwabach, and composed the Articles of the Lutheran faith. They held that

> The Eucharist or Sacrament of the Altar ... consists of two parts, viz., that there is truly present in the bread and wine, the true Body and Blood of Christ according to the sound of the words: "This is my body, this is my blood," and that it is not only bread and wine, as even now the other side asserts. These words require and also convey faith, and also exercise it in all those who desire this sacrament, and do not act against it....[24]

These words reinforced the position taken by Chancellor Brueck in his Reasons Against Union With The Zwinglian Estates, which had appeared directly after Marburg. It dwelt primarily upon the evident division between the two groups over the sacrament. The influence of Brenz and the other Lutherans can be seen in the sacramental ideas it incorporated. The Chancellor argued "that the words of Christ prove that the Zwinglian doctrine concerning the holy sacrament is contrary to the clear and lucid Word of God as recorded by the three evangelists and St. Paul.... It is a horrible error so to teach of the sacrament as the Zwinglians do...."[25]

It is to be assumed that both of these works above can be traced to the influence of Luther's Bekenntnis vom Abentmahl Christi (Confession on the Supper of Christ) of 1528:

---

[24]Martin Reu, Augsburg Confession (Chicago, 1930), p. 43*.

[25]Ibid., p. 62*.

> In the Lord's Supper the true Body and Blood are orally eaten and drunk in the bread and wine, even if the priest who administers it or those who receive it do not believe or otherwise misuse it, because it does not depend upon man's faith or unbelief, but on God's Word and institution. Unless, indeed, they first change God's Word and institution and misinterpret it, like the present day enemies of the sacrament, who in truth have only bread and wine because they do not have the Word and instituted order of God, but they have perverted it and altered it according to their own fancies.[26]

Bucer attacked the position at Schwabach, maintaining that there "is no scriptural basis for holding that the true body and true blood of Christ are in the bread and wine, for the words read, 'This is my body' and not, 'In this is my body.'"[27] He strengthened his argument by the use of John 6 and denied that I Corinthians 10 had any validity here.[28]

The Schwabach Articles were presented at Smalcald in December, 1529, to the signers of the "Protest." These articles later became the seventeen basic articles of the first part of the Augsburg Confession of 1530.

The scene now shifted to Torgau in March, 1530. The

---

[26] Ibid., p. 28*.

[27] Ibid., Bucer's Critique of the Schwabach Articles, November, 1529, p. 55*.

[28] Verse 16, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" This passage was used by the Lutherans to prove that both visible and invisible elements are present in the sacrament.

Lutherans met there to draw up articles to present to Emperor Charles V at the next meeting of the Diet. The Torgau meeting was called at the insistence of Duke William IV, John of Saxony, and Louis X of Bavaria. The Torgau Articles,[29] as they are called, opposed the Zwinglian position on the sacrament. They state that

> the Zwinglian doctrine is also earnestly contended against, as the writings published concerning it in my Lord's lands show; and the people carefully are instructed, that in the Supper the Body and Blood of Christ are present, and that they are given; for thereby faith is strengthened that consolation is received, that Christ wishes to be ours....[30]

The Articles of both Schwabach and Torgau were designed to show that the Lutheran position differed both from the Zwinglian and the Roman doctrine on the sacrament. These statements of faith by Luther, Brenz, and others were needed to answer the attacks of both groups.

The Roman attack came in March, 1530, from Eck's "404 Articles." He tried to lump both the Lutheran and Zwinglian groups together, maintaining that the two parties were one with respect to several of the articles dealing with the Lord's Supper:

> 235 - In the Eucharist, the substance of bread and wine remains; because transubstantiation is a figment of sophists and Romanists.
> 236 - I firmly believe not only that the body of Christ

---

[29]Clyde Manschreck, op. cit., p. 176 holds that the articles have never been definitely identified.

[30]Martin Reu, op. cit., p. 86*.

is in the bread, but also that the bread is the body of Christ.

237 - As the body of Christ is in the bread, while there is neither body nor soul, so the blood of Christ in the wine is without body and soul.

238 - In the Eucharist, the true body of Christ is not really present, but only figuratively as a symbol.

241 - The body of Christ can be only in one place; hence if it is to be received by us, it must leave the right hand of God.[31]

Eck attempted to show that, since there was no difference between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians, both should be condemned at Augsburg.

In 1529, Emperor Charles V concluded his second war with Francis I of France and had returned to Germany to deal with the religious issue. The Imperial Diet was called to meet at Augsburg in April, 1530.

Since Luther could not attend the Diet because of the imperial ban, the major roles fell to Brenz and Melanchthon. It is obvious that the Confession presented at Augsburg was a statement based on the previous doctrinal declarations drawn up with the aid of Luther, Melanchthon, and Brenz. It has correctly been shown that the Confession

> was not the work of men without authority to represent the church, but was the voice of all the churches. Its groundwork was laid by Luther; materials were brought together by the great theologians of the whole Lutheran Church -- by Brentius, Jonas, Spalatin, and others -- who carefully examined and tested each other's work.[32]

---

[31] Ibid., p. 110*.

[32] Theodore E. Schmauk and C. Theodore Benze, The Confessional Principle and the Confessions of the Lutheran Church (Philadelphia, 1911), p. 126.

Melanchthon, of course, is always listed as the author of the Confession and Brenz agrees, saying, "we have drawn up an epitome of our doctrine; Philip Melanchthon being its author."[33] It is certain, however, that Brenz and the others played a major role in the formulation of the Confession since they had been present both at Torgau and Schwabach at the time of the formulation of the basic articles and were present now at Augsburg. Melanchthon alludes to this dependence upon Brenz, saying, "I would rather have only one Brenz with me at the Diet, than any of the other theologians, for this one is understanding and steady, combining advice and action."[34] Zöckler speaks of the contributions made by Brenz at Augsburg, although he does not seem to relate them directly to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.[35]

In the background at Augsburg there was much maneuvering by Bucer and Philip of Hesse in an attempt to get more uniformity of witness among the reforming groups. Brenz refused to negotiate with Bucer except in writing[36] since some said that Bucer had spread the rumor after Marburg that Brenz agreed with him.[37] Brenz opposed Bucer for he had found that

---

[33] C. R., II, 124.

[34] Hartmann and Jäger, op. cit., I, 251.

[35] Otto Zöckler, Die Augsburgische Confession (Frankfurt, 1870), p. 18.

[36] C. R., II, 187.

[37] Ibid., II, 238.

"when Bucer is with us he pretends he is not far from our opinion; when absent he states that we have yielded to his belief."[38] Bucer, with some of the Strassburgers, asked the Lutherans for permission to sign the Augsburg Confession with the omission of Article X on the Eucharist.[39] Permission was not granted. After this rebuff, Bucer joined Capito in the writing of the Confessio Tetrapolitana.[40] It was the confession of the four south German cities of Constance, Lindau, Memmingen, and Strassburg, neighboring cities to the duchy of Württemberg. Schaff[41] has observed Bucer's influence in Chapter XVIII:

> The doctrine of the Lord's Supper is couched in dubious language, which was intended to comprehend in substance the Lutheran and Zwinglian theories ... it said, Christ offers to his followers, as truly now as at the institution, his very body and blood as spiritual food and drink, whereby their souls are nourished to everlasting life. Nothing is said of oral manducation ... a distinctive feature of the Lutheran view.

Two years later these cities joined the other Lutheran cities in subscribing to the Augustana.

---

[38] Ibid., II, 356.

[39] John T. McNeill, op. cit., p. 149.

[40] The text is found in E. F. K. Müller, Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche im authentischen Texten (Leipzig, 1903), pp. 55-78. See also Walch, XX, pp. 1966-2008 and Henry Eyster Jacobs, Book of Concord (Philadelphia, 1882-83), II, 179-208.

[41] Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom (New York, 1896-99), I, 528-529.

Philip of Hesse represented the interests of Zwingli at Augsburg. He was not Zwinglian himself but desired a reconciliation between the Lutherans and Zwinglians in the interest of religious harmony. He had been somewhat friendly toward Zwingli after he had met him at Marburg and made the following overture to Brenz and Melanchthon in a personal letter of June 11, 1530:

> This error on the sacrament is not one such error that should keep us apart, for we are all united and believe and confess one Christ and seek to become holy through that same one. They hold God's Word truly in all things save that which is called an error by you; but they are only of another opinion in the understanding of the words of the sacrament. Therefore I think that since they are united with us in all other things, they confess Christ to such an extent as we confess him, and that they agree that one eats Christ in the supper through faith, which eating is necessary for holiness, and do not say that God cannot do this or that ... that there is enough agreement between us for unity.[42]

Two days later Brenz and Melanchthon met at dinner with Philip and replied to his proposed union of the Protestants by saying that they greatly regretted the division among all evangelical Christians but still could not regard as brethren those who professed and defended erroneous doctrines. They added that those who allegorized in the doctrine of the Supper would also introduce other dangerous errors and occasion much offense and great confusion.[43]

---

[42] C. R., II, 97.

[43] Ibid., II, 118.

Although Brenz and Melanchthon usually answered with a united voice, there were places where the latter seemed to waver in his conviction. There were times when he offered to give up a position to the Roman Church for the sake of harmony and at other times he offered to make a compromise with the Zwinglians. This worried Luther, who wrote to Brenz,

> I learn, my dear Brenz, that you likewise are being worried in that assembly of the gods. It is Philip's example that is moving you. He is zealously concerned for the public peace and for posterity, but his zeal is not wise.... I am writing this in order that Gregorius Brueck or someone else among you may speak to Philip and get him to cease being the regent of the world.... Try to see whether Philip cannot be persuaded through you -- of whom he must believe that you are a man of God -- though he is not moved by my words.[44]

It would seem that Philip Melanchthon with the help of the others at Augsburg did remain firm here on the doctrine of the sacrament. We find him on July 12 writing to Brenz, calling the views of Zwingli on the sacrament "contrary to Scripture."[45] Melanchthon, however, later did change in his estimation of the Zwinglian position.

The Augsburg Confession thus summarized the position of Luther, Brenz, Melanchthon, and the other Lutheran men. It was read to the Diet by Chancellor Brueck. Article X states the Lutheran position on the sacrament:

---

[44] Ibid., II, 718.

[45] W. A., Br. V, 201.

> Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the body and blood of Christ are truly present and are communicated to those who eat in the Lord's Supper. And they disapprove of those who teach otherwise.[46]

Melanchthon summarized it by saying that it is "juxta sententiam Lutheri = according to or near the teaching of Luther."[47] In this Brenz fully concurred.

The Roman party at Augsburg was asked by Charles V to prepare an answer to the Lutheran statement. Brenz scoffs that "it is reported that they are preparing wagon loads of commentaries against our confession,"[48] and that their leader is that "good man Eck. The rest are 23 in number. One might call them an Iliad of Sophists."[49]

The answer, or the Confutation, drawn up by Eck and other members of the Roman party, was presented to the Emperor who returned it to the authors for further work. Brenz wrote to Isenmann:

> I heard today that the confession of the sophists was returned by the Emperor to its authors, the sophists, and for this reason that it was so confused, jumbled, vehement, bloodthirsty, and cruel, that he was ashamed to have it read before the Imperial Diet.... We

---

[46]Translation of the Latin version. It is a surprisingly moderate statement considering the controversy already in progress, but this is understandable since the Augustana was generally moderate in the hope of a reconciliation with the Roman Church.

[47]C. R., II, 143.

[48]Ibid., p. 180.

[49]Ibid., Brenz to Myconias.

> experience daily that we have so bewildered, stunned, and confused them that they know not where to begin or end.[50]

The Confutation as finally presented was considered a poor work and the Lutherans were not permitted to have a copy. But they had taken notes on it and used these as a basis for later replies. Brenz wryly writes that "the Emperor maintains neutrality; for he slept both when the Augustana and when the Confutation were read."[51] The results of the Diet hardly showed neutrality on the part of the Emperor.

The Edict of Worms was to be enforced upon the Lutherans after April 15, 1531, unless they returned to the Roman Church's fold. This amounted to a verdict at the Diet of Augsburg which was substantially that of Worms in 1521.

Zwingli also had sent to Augsburg his Ratio Fidei (A System of Faith), which sets forth his sacramental position to the Emperor:

> I believe that in the Holy Eucharist - i. e., the supper of thanksgiving - the true body of Christ is present ...
>
> ... the natural body of Christ is not eaten with our mouth ...
>
> ... the words: "This is my body," should be received not naturally, but figuratively ...

---

[50] Ibid., p. 198, July 15, 1530, Brenz to Isenmann.

[51] Ibid., II, 245. The Lutherans were heard to laugh

> In the words "This is my body" ... he gave a sign of his body.[52]

The Emperor refused permission to have it read before the Diet.

Melanchthon, meanwhile, on the basis of notes taken at the Diet, composed an answer to the Confutation which is known as the Apology to the Augsburg Confession. This defense, which appeared in Latin in 1531, stated that

> we believe that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and truly tendered, with those things which are seen, bread and wine, to those who receive this sacrament.[53]

Melanchthon supported his position with the addition of I Corinthians 10:16: "the bread is the communion of the Lord's body," and cited Vulgarius' teaching that the "bread is not a mere figure, but is truly changed into flesh," and added Cyril's interpretation of John 15 that "Christ is corporeally offered to us."[54]

In the years that followed the Diet and the publication of the Apology, Melanchthon and Brenz carried on some correspondence concerning the presentations. In 1531 Brenz wrote of the Apology, "I judge it to be worthy of the canon."[55]

---

[52]Henry Eyster Jacobs, Book of Concord, op. cit., II, 170, 172, 173, and 175. Pages 158 to 179 contain an English translation of the entire work.

[53]Triglotta, p. 247, The Apology.

[54]Ibid.

[55]C. R., II, 510.

After Augsburg the Emperor was busy with political and military matters and could not enforce the Edict. Both Lutherans and Zwinglians gained greater support in many places. The issue of the difference in sacramental interpretation still plagued the reforming movements. It was becoming obvious that the Protestants would have to deal with this vexing question before unity could be possible.

With the death of Zwingli in the second Battle of Cappel in 1531, and with the death of Oecolampadius on November 24 of the same year, the Swiss reform movement received new leaders. Heinrich Bullinger, the son-in-law of Zwingli, became the leader of the Zwinglian movement. Bucer married Oecolampadius' widow in 1532. In the same year he was asked by the council of Strassburg to compose a memorial on the matter of the sacrament which they wished to send to the Emperor. From this point he takes over the position formerly held by Oecolampadius. Bucer, in spite of the opposition to him by Brenz and Luther, still hoped to bring about a reconciliation between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians. Opposition toward him was led by the Swabian cities under the leadership of Brenz of Württemberg.

In the years 1531-1534, things were relatively peaceful on the religious scene in Germany. The Religious Peace of Nuremberg of July 23, 1532, granted the Lutherans rights in exchange for the help they gave the Emperor against the

Turks. In the latter year the leaders of the Smalcald League went to the support of Württemberg in its struggle to restore Duke Ulrich to power. The Treaty of Kaaden in that year accomplished the aims of the Lutherans. On July, 15, 1535, Ulrich invited Brenz to come and advise him on the formulation of regulations for the church, on visitations, and on marriage rules in his duchy.[56]

Bucer, still concerned about concord among the Protestants, felt that the time was growing close when such agreement would become possible. In August, 1535, he came to visit the Württemberg churches and to confer with Brenz, who was now the pastor of the Stuttgart church. This was an attempt to ameliorate the differences he had had with Brenz in the past. Brenz agreed to Bucer's plan for the preconference of evangelical preachers which served as the initial step for the Wittenberg meetings in 1536. Brenz was still not completely satisfied that Bucer was serious and that he was not still a Zwinglian. Caspar Hedio wrote to Brenz on August 18, 1535, asking him not to block the move toward harmony.[57] After the visit of Bucer to Stuttgart, Brenz seems to have moderated in his position toward Bucer.[58]

---

[56] T. P., 129.

[57] Ibid., 131.

[58] Ibid., 137.

In 1536, two things happened which threw more suspicion upon Bucer in Brenz's eyes. There came from Basel an edition of Iohannis Oecolampadii et Huldrichi Zwingli Epistolarum Libri Quatuor (Four Books of Letters Between Johann Oecolampadius and Huldrich Zwingli). Bucer had written a preface to the work in which he tried to sanction both sides of the controversy, the Lutheran and the Zwinglian. This aroused Brenz and many others against Bucer. At two conferences at Basel in 1536, Bucer and Capito attempted to get the following statement on the Lord's Supper adopted:

> Truly the Supper is a mystery, in which the Lord offers His body and blood, that is, His own self truly to His disciples for this purpose, that more and more He may live in them and they in Him. Not that the body and blood of the Lord are united either naturally with the bread and wine, or are included locally in them, or are offered by a carnal presence, but that the bread and wine are symbols by the institution of the Lord, in which the true bestowal of His body and blood is presented by the Lord Himself, through the ministry of the Church, not as food to be destroyed in the stomach, but as nourishment to eternal life.[59]

Although this was not accepted by Bern, Bullinger obtained approval of it by the Council of Zurich.

A meeting between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians had originally been scheduled for Eisenach, but had to be changed because of the illness of Luther. Luther met with Bucer and Capito on May 22, 1536. Not being in a good

---

[59]Hastings Eells, Martin Bucer (New Haven, 1931), p. 135.

humor, he told them the works on the sacrament which contained error must be given up and they must accept the Lutheran position or there could be no concord. The talks and the discussions, however, went on for almost a week with the highlight being the partaking of the Lord's Supper by both the Zwinglians and the Lutherans on the following Sunday. The work of composing a document of concord was given to Melanchthon. The articles which deal with the Supper were:

> They confess, according to the words of Irenaeus, that the Eucharist is composed of two things, an earthly and a heavenly. Thus they believe and teach, that the body and blood of Christ is truly and substantially present, offered, and taken with the bread and wine.
>
> And although they deny that transubstantiation takes place, they do not believe a local inclusion in the bread is effected, or any lasting union outside of the use of the sacrament, yet they grant that by sacramental union, the bread is the body of Christ, that is, they believe that, when the bread is proffered, the body of Christ is at the same time present and truly offered. For they believe the body of Christ is not present, when outside the ceremony it is preserved in a box, or is shown in processions, as is done by the papists. Next, they believe this institution of the sacrament has power in the church, which does not depend upon the worthiness either of those who minister or receive. And as for Paul's statement that the unworthy also eat; they believe that the body and blood of the Lord are also truly offered to the unworthy, and the unworthy take them, when they observe the words and institution of Christ. But they eat them to their judgment, as Paul says, because they abuse the sacrament, since they use it without faith in Him. For the sacrament was instituted that it might testify that all those who are truly penitent and put their faith in Christ have the benefits of Christ applied to them, and are made

> members of Christ, and are washed in the blood of Christ.[60]

The Wittenberg Concord did not bring full harmony between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians for the latter felt it too Lutheran. It did, however, bring about a sharp difference among the Zwinglians. The moderate group who could accept this document gradually moved over into fellowship with the Lutheran Church.

Bucer tried in vain to get the Swiss churches to approve the Concord, but Bullinger argued against it and it failed to gain much support in the Swiss areas. Brenz wrote several reports on it. In June he wrote to John Luthmann giving his rather qualified agreement with it, but still indicating his partial dissatisfaction with it relative to the sacramental statements.[61]

Bucer joined Luther, Brenz, and others at the meeting of the Smalcald League on February 7, 1537. He was favorably received by the Lutherans and participated in the discussions which led to the formulation of the Smalcald Articles. The article on the Lord's Supper stated:

> Of the Sacrament of the Altar we hold that bread and wine in the Supper are the true body and blood of Christ, and are given and received not only by the godly, but also by the wicked Christians.[62]

---

[60] Ibid., pp. 202-203.

[61] T. P., 147.

[62] Triglotta, Part III, Article VI, p. 493.

Melanchthon was impressed by Bucer here and wrote to Camerarius, "Bucer spoke openly and clearly of the mystery the Lord's Supper , affirming the presence of Christ."[63]

The Articles were signed by Bugenhagen "in the name of Magister John Brentz, as on departing from Smalcald he directed me orally and by a letter, which I have shown to these brethren who have subscribed."[64] Brenz had left to go to the University of Tübingen to reform the university at the request of the duke of Württemberg.

Luther, who had been ill at the time of the drawing up of the Wittenberg Concord, seemed still in a bad mood. Some of the clergy attempted to estrange him from Melanchthon. The seeds of discord were sown by rumor mongers, but they failed to split the two theologians. That there was a difference in their theological stance relative to the sacrament did not appear until after the death of Luther when Brenz and Melanchthon assumed their roles in the later controversy.

The discussion on the sacrament in the Swiss cities was carried on between Bucer and Bullinger. As we have seen, they could not agree on the Wittenberg Concord. When they began negotiations for the development of their own document,

---

[63] C. R., III, 292.

[64] Book of Concord: English text of the Concordia Triglotta (St. Louis, 1950), p. 149.

they found a greater degree of harmony. In 1536, the Swiss drew up and signed the First Helvetic Confession, committing themselves to a position which "is essentially Zwinglian, yet emphasizes the significance of the sacramental signs and the real presence of Christ, who gives his body and blood - that is, himself - to believers, so that he more and more lives in them and they in him."[65]

The Swiss were still very much interested in trying to establish harmony with the Lutherans. Since it was becoming evident that there was not much hope for agreement with either Luther or Brenz, they tried to deal directly with Melanchthon. They were especially encouraged by Melanchthon's change of Article X of the Augsburg Confession: "Of the Lord's Supper they teach that together with the bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ are truly tendered to those that eat in the supper."[66]

Luther had already shown that he would not cooperate with the Swiss by his A Short Confession on the Holy Sacrament, Against the Fanatics:

> To the fanatics and enemies of the Sacrament -- Carlstadt, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Stenkefeld [Schwenkfeld] and their disciples in Zuruck and

---

[65]Philip Schaff, Creeds of Christendom (New York, 1899), I, 389 lends credence to the observation that all the reformers believed in the real presence, the difference came over the question of "how" He was really present.

[66]Pages 26-27. Variata.

> wherever they are.... Before I die I want to bear witness against them. The twaddle about spiritual eating and drinking and the unity of the participants are fig leaves to cover up the sins of "blasphemers and liars." The common people can be excused, but the masters not.... He who does not want to remain, let him go.[67]

Manschreck believes that the last phrase might have encouraged Melanchthon to deal with the Swiss.[68] Luther's deep concern over the sacramental teaching, even among the faculty at Wittenberg, is described in the Historical Introduction of the Triglotta:

> It was above all the spirit of indifferentism toward false doctrine, particularly concerning the Lord's Supper, which Luther observed and deplored in his Wittenberg colleagues: Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, Cruciger, Eber, and Major.... About the same time (near his death) Luther had written above the entrance to his study: "Our professors are to be examined on the Lord's Supper."[69]

Melanchthon seemed more willing to compromise with the Swiss, but he did not want to take any further steps until after the death of Luther. Brenz had already shown his opposition to the Swiss position on the sacrament and his distrust of Bucer and the Zwinglians.

Brenz spent the years from the signing of the Concord until the death of Luther in attending and participating in a number of meetings concerned with various aspects of

---

[67] W. A., LIII (119), 141-143.

[68] Clyde Manschreck, op. cit., p. 245.

[69] Triglotta, op. cit., p. 94.

church life. He was called upon to aid in the reform of the University of Tübingen and also to assist in the drawing up of numerous church orders.

In the period after Augsburg it is evident that Brenz was developing a rigidity of doctrine that would cause trouble in the years after Luther's death. His tenacity is particularly pronounced on the sacramental issues. He was perhaps afraid that the Lutheran teaching of the real presence was endangered by the Swiss desire for unity without agreement in every area. Brenz became more dogmatic and less flexible in this period of the controversy.

## The Controversy After 1546

Luther's death in 1546 and the outbreak of the Smalcaldic War signalled another period of stress within the Protestant churches over the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Brenz was forced to flee Württemberg[70] and carry on his discussion of the matter from one site to another. The strife over the sacrament now became one in which the Adiaphoristic Controversy played a major role. The figures that came into prominence along with Brenz were John Calvin and Melanchthon.

We have seen how Brenz had to flee his native duchy in order to protect himself against the Emperor and his chancellor,

---

[70] T. P., 258 and 260 describe Brenz's flight.

Granvelle. Melanchthon, now released from the influence of Luther, openly began to take a different tack on the sacrament. Bucer removed himself to England and remained there at Cambridge until his death in 1551.

The Adiaphoristic Controversy centered about the newly established Augsburg Interim of 1547 and the Leipzig Interim of 1548. The question revolved about what was the true definition of an "adiaphoron." A normal definition would hold that an adiaphoron is a thing neither directly commanded nor forbidden by God in the Bible. During this struggle, Brenz tended to exclude from adiaphora anything that Luther had taught relative to the sacrament. Melanchthon tried to broaden the definition to include more doctrines. Thus for Brenz the interpretation of the doctrine of the real presence is not to be an adiaphoron, but for Melanchthon it gradually becomes one.

During the controversy over adiaphora the Philippists were dubbed the "Interimists." It covered the period from 1548 to 1555. The leaders were the theologians of Wittenberg and Leipzig such as Melanchthon, Eber, and Pfeffinger, who defended both Interims and were willing to accept the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Church provided they did not have to give up any basic Lutheran doctrines. Flacius led the opposition of the Gnesio-Lutherans, or staunch conservatives, and argued that nothing could be an adiaphoron

which was important to the life of the church and its confession. With the failure of the Interims to accomplish their purpose of bringing peace to the churches, Melanchthon gave in and wrote to Flacius and the Saxon pastors:

> I was drawn into the insidious deliberations (on the Interims) of the courts. Therefore, if in any way I have either fallen or been too weak, I ask forgiveness of God and the Church, and I shall submit to the judgments of the Church.[71]

Brenz wrote a number of letters against the Interims.[72] Pressel has cited a number of them which passed between him, Calvin, and others.[73] Brenz was vitally concerned about adiaphora in the defense of his sacramental position and entered into the controversy about them after the publication of the Interims. Köhler has listed for us an undated manuscript of Brenz on the question: It is Very Useful to Read Johann Brenz on Intermediate Things or Adiaphora.[74] It would seem that Brenz considered the Interims a "ruin," not only because they compelled him to flee his home, but also because they caused Melanchthon and others to make dangerous concessions with respect to the adiaphora.

---

[71] C. R., 9, 61.

[72] Köhler, Brentiana, 162, Bedenken etlicher Predicanten als der zu Schwaebischen Hall der in Hessen und der Stadt N. N. aufs Interim ihrer Oberkeit uebereicht.

[73] T. P., 282, 288, and 291.

[74] Köhler, Brentiana, 676. Des Herrn Johannis Brentii von Mitteldingen oder Adiaphoris sehr nutzlich zu lesen.

Melanchthon seems to have somewhat moderated his own position on questionable things, when, in the Frankfort Recess of 1558, he affirmed this position on adiaphora:

> Where the true Christian doctrine of the holy Gospel is polluted or persecuted, there the adiaphora as well as other ceremonies are detrimental and injurious.[75]

Heinrich Bullinger and John Calvin, the inheritors of the Reformed traditions in Switzerland, moved toward an agreement on the sacrament apart from the Lutheranism as represented by Melanchthon and Brenz. Bullinger, already closely wrapped up in the Sacramentarian Controversy, tended toward a more extreme position than that of Zwingli. In 1546, he sent to Calvin a work he had prepared on the sacrament. This began an interchange between the two men that led to a basic agreement over the Lord's Supper. This document, the Zurich Consensus, or the Consensus Tigurinus of 1549

> consists of twenty-six brief propositions drawn up by Calvin, with annotations by Bullinger, to which Calvin responded.... They assert that the Sacraments are not in and of themselves effective and conferring grace, but that God, through the Holy Spirit, acts through them as means; that the internal effect appears only in the elect; that the good of the Sacraments consists in leading us to Christ, and being instruments of the grace of God, which is sincerely offered to all; that in baptism we receive the remission of sins, although this proceeds primarily not from baptism, but from the blood of Christ; that in the Lord's Supper we

---

[75] C. R., 9, 501.

> eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, not however, by means of a carnal presence of Christ's human nature, which is in heaven, but by the power of the Holy Spirit and the devout elevation of our soul to heaven.[76]
>
> All who partake of the sacraments do not partake of the reality ... the elect receives what the sacraments offer ... according to the measure of his faith.
>
> No local presence must be imagined in the sacrament. "This is my body" -- we repudiate as preposterous ... the taking of these words in the precisely literal sense ... they must be taken figuratively.
>
> The body of Christ, bearing the nature and mode of a human body, is finite and contained in heaven as its place; it is necessarily as distant from us in point of space as heaven is from the earth.[77]

This agreement was signed by Calvin, Farel, and Bullinger and was published at both Zurich and Geneva in 1551. Brenz, of course, was totally unwilling to accept such a statement on the presence of Christ in the sacrament. Melanchthon at the moment was quiet on the matter. Manschreck might well have the answer to the problem of the ideas of Melanchthon on the sacrament:

> "This is my body" (for Melanchthon) came to mean a spiritual allusion to the presence of Christ at all times and in all places, not a physical presence, not simply a memorial. The form of the union of Christ with the bread and the wine posed a mystery, the mystery of faith.[78]

---

[76]Philip Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, op. cit., I, 472.

[77]John Calvin, Tracts and Treatises on the Doctrine and Worship of the Church, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids, 1958), II, 217, 219, and 220.

[78]Clyde Manschreck, op. cit., p. 232.

It can be seen that the use of the word "spiritual" would make Melanchthon more amenable to the "spiritual presence" as taught by the Swiss. Melanchthon further endeared himself to the Genevans with his revisions of the Augsburg Confession, the Variata.[79] He was generally more moderate in his views relative to the Swiss after Calvin had given his approval to the Variata.

Brenz had met Calvin after 1547 and had been graciously received by him, but this friendship did not mature, primarily because Bullinger attacked Brenz and this was followed by a barrage of literature involving also the reformers of Geneva.

The scene was now set for the height of the controversy which arose after 1550. The date is an arbitrary one, but perhaps well taken for by May, 1549, Calvin and Bullinger had reached a unified decision on the sacrament, Brenz had already taken his stand with Luther on the Lord's Supper, and Melanchthon and his followers were vacillating on the issue. The troubles over the sacrament from this point to 1580 were to stem from Melanchthon's indecision.

---

[79]It is interesting to note that the publication of the Variata did not cause any storm of protest in the church of Germany. Luther did not protest the changes on the sacrament, nor was any other objection heard at the time. The churches of Germany continued in the use of the text either altered or unaltered, whichever text they happened to have. The matter of the text came into prominence only when the Roman Catholics made it an issue at the meetings they held with Lutherans.

# CHAPTER FOUR

## THE HEIGHT OF THE CONTROVERSY

### German Church Organization

It is necessary at this point to examine one of the factors that permitted the controversy to continue in such length and with such great elaboration. It is found in the study of the development of church organization in Germany, the area of southwestern Germany which most concerns us for a study of Johann Brenz. We have previously noted that Brenz was often called upon by cities and towns in and outside of his native Württemberg to aid them in the reform of their areas. The nature of the reform suggested reveals that Brenz's influence was particularly strong in the area of church organization.

It has also been noted that many of the areas in which he was active were places which jealously guarded their own imperial rights. This amounted to an autonomy in the medieval world which recognized an order or a "great chain of being." These areas knew and understood their own rights and were accustomed to a rigidly organized structure in both the church and the state. The result of Lutheran reorganization in these areas incorporated both the rights and the

order to which men had been accustomed in the past. Brenz's new order of Reformation took these factors into account when the reorganization came.

The imperial diets and the Emperor recognized the rights the free imperial areas possessed. The recognition of these privileges is implicit in an embryonic cuius regio, eius religio (whoever rules, sets the religion) concept that can be traced back to some of the earliest attempts of the Emperor to deal with the Lutheran Reformation. When, at the first diet of Speyer in 1526, the ruling was given that each territorial ruler was to act and govern in matters pertaining to the Edict of Worms "as each would wish to be held accountable before God and the Emperor,"[1] the principle later formulated was then tacitly accepted. Each of the Recesses granted by the Emperor to the Lutheran parties before the final formulation of the principle at Augsburg in 1555 gave support to the rulers and to their old rights in both church and state matters.

For Württemberg this became a reality with the final restoration of Duke Ulrich in 1534 and the Treaty of Kaaden recognized this practical right for the duke. It is at this point that Ulrich calls in Brenz and asks for church orders for the duchy. Köhler lists the support for this thesis

---

[1]Luthers Werke, St. Louis edition, XVI, 210.

during that period.[2]

Both of the dukes under whom Brenz labored, Ulrich and Christopher, accepted this role in their duchy. For Brenz the position of the duke was established by God and God's sanction in view of the doctrine of the vocation as enunciated by Luther. The duke and all others within God's established order had a role with a divine sanction. The ruler had the highest role to play for his government was, before God, responsible not only for good rule, but also for the church and its doctrine. The welfare of God's Church depended upon the proper functioning of the ruler in his role as a Christian leader.

Organization was necessary for the proper functioning of both the church and state in a God-pleasing fashion. The model which was known to all had political roots. It was then easy for the church leaders in conjunction with the political arm to fashion a church system based upon that organization best known to them.

The church reorganization suggested by Brenz to Ulrich in 1535[3] was a result of church visitations conducted in the duchy. The visitors suggested the formulation of a consistory or an organized body to deal with the church problems within

---

[2]Köhler, Brentiana, 66, 67, 68, 72, and 73.

[3]T. P., 129 and 145.

the Württemberg sphere of influence. The consistory was not then accepted by Ulrich for reasons known best to himself. In May, 1547, the first Visitation Ordinance for Württemberg was accepted which brought into being a consistorial system in the duchy.[4] Unfortunately, it was negated by the Smalcald Wars and the resultant Interims in 1547 and 1548. It was left to Duke Christopher to restore the system to full working power in 1553. Brenz was ready in that year with a well developed church order.[5]

Northern Germany had also followed a similar development of church orders. John Frederick, following similar organizational patterns, caused the first one to be developed for Wittenberg in 1539. The resultant consistory was made up of two theologians and two lawyers to whom the authority was given to call synods to deal with theological questions that might disturb the churches. The General Synod which was organized found its parallel in the Diet of the Empire, the district synods corresponding to local diets or estates. In the tradition of the medieval "chain of being," authority was linear from the top. Superintendents ruled the local synods which were made up of clergy. The district synods

---

[4]Although Brenz did not formally present a church order in this year, he had been developing them since 1535. See Köhler, Brentiana, 89, 90, 110, 111, 122, and 123.

[5]Ibid., 250 and 251.

were composed of the superintendents themselves in conclave with the ruler and his consistory.

In Württemberg, under the leadership of Brenz, the form of the consistory varied slightly. In the church order of 1553 the title of the consistory was "Visitationsrat" and in that order of 1559, "Kirchenrat."[6] The order for this duchy in southwestern Germany had three theologians, four political counsellors, and a secular director to carry on its affairs. It met regularly during the week with the provost of Stuttgart who held the highest clerical office in the duchy, Johann Brenz.

This brief study of the development of the territorial church system in Lutheran areas of Germany can serve to give us a clearer understanding of both the autonomy of the Reformation churches and the development of independent churches within Germany. The consistories so established had control of both the doctrine and church practices within their areas. This control was strengthened by the power given to the consistories through the role they played in the control of clergy, the use of ecclesiastical discipline, and the power to convene synods for the control of doctrine and practice within a given area. This accounts for the variety of doctrine and practice within Germany itself and

---

[6]James Martin Estes, op. cit., pp. 144-149.

helps to bring on the confusion that is prevalent in the controversy over the sacrament after the death of Luther.

It is thus also possible to see that a strong personality within a given area could set the policies and often set that area against another one. In southwestern Germany Brenz takes the leadership and his influence is felt in the neighboring areas. Northern Germany finds its champions in Melanchthon and Wittenberg. Thus it is that the two areas develop as Lutheran areas, but become involved in the controversy over the sacrament as each follows its acknowledged leader. Resolution does not come between the areas until the Formula of Concord is accepted by many territorial churches of Germany in 1580 and after. These two areas are not the only territorial subdivisions within the church at this time as the many preliminary confessions that lead to the formation the Formula of Concord attest, but these two play most important and influential roles.

## The Progress of the Controversy After 1550

After the death of Luther, the acceptance of the Interim by Melanchthon and the Wittenbergers, and the establishment of more fraternal relations between Melanchthon and Calvin, there was a widening gulf between Brenz and the Melanchthonians. Around 1550 the division is not yet so evident as it later became.

The Council of Trent had met spasmodically since 1545 and had not yet come to grips with the major problems it had to face. Two documents drawn up for the council by the Lutherans in 1551 show only slight differences on the sacrament. The Confessio Saxonica, written by Melanchthon, said of the Lord's Supper,

> Both Baptism and the Supper of the Lord are pledges and testimonies of grace.... Christ is present in this communion, truly and substantially, and the body and blood of Christ are indeed given to the receivers.... Then he (the pastor) speaks the words of Christ concerning the institution of the Supper and he himself takes and distributes to the receivers the whole Sacrament, who come reverently thereunto....[7]

Brenz, feeling himself constrained to promote the position of Württemberg to the Council, is more extensive in his article dealing with the Lord's Supper:

> Touching the substance of the Eucharist, we may thus think and teach that the true Body of Christ and His true Blood are distributed in the Eucharist; and we refute them that say that the bread and wine of the Eucharist are signs of the Body and Blood of Christ, being only absent. Also we believe that the omnipotence of God is so great, that in the Eucharist He may either annihilate the substance of bread and wine, or else change them into the Body and Blood of Christ; but that God does exercise this His absolute omnipotence in the Eucharist, is not shown by any clear statement of Scripture.
>
> When it is said of the bread, "This is my body," it is not necessary that the substance of the bread be changed into the substance of the Body of Christ; but for the truth of the Sacrament it is sufficient

---

[7]Martin Reu, op. cit., pp. 411* and 414*.

> that the Body and Christ is present with the bread. And indeed the very necessity of the truth of the Sacrament does not seem to require that the true bread should remain with the true presence of the Body of Christ.[8]

In 1552 Brenz went to Trent with this draft of the Württemberg Confession, but it was not received by the Council.[9]

The differences between the Wittenberg and the Württemberg confessions were not too great on the matter of the sacrament, but there were other problems which began to emerge. The controversies within the Lutheran church after Luther's death had seriously alienated many people and divided the Lutheran Church into parties. The Gnesio-Lutherans were ever on the alert for any discrepancies which might creep into the church. They were particularly suspicious of the Philippists. Some of them felt that these followers of Melanchthon were trying to gradually supplant Luther's doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper with a Calvinistic interpretation. Because this was not an overt act, the movement has come to be called crypto-Calvinistic.

One of the first to note this change toward Calvinism was Joachim Westphal (1510-1574), a Lutheran pastor in Hamburg. He had been a student of both Melanchthon and Luther at Wittenberg, had studied at Jena with some of the

---

[8] Ibid., p. 419*.

[9] T. P., 317 and 318. These letters contain Duke Christopher's instructions to Brenz for his trip to Trent.

Gnesio-Lutherans, and had taken leadership in the earlier controversies, notably over the Interims and adiaphora. In 1552, he published a warning to the church against denying the real presence, A Collection of the Confusing and Varied Opinions Concerning the Lord's Supper, Collected From the Writings of the Sacramentarians.[10] The following year he published, The Correct Faith concerning the Lord's Supper, Strengthened and Shown from the Words of St. Paul and the Evangelists.[11] He stressed I Corinthians 11 on the sacrament and also the words of institution as Luther held them in the doctrine of the real presence. He thus joined Brenz in warning the Lutherans in Germany that Calvin actually denied the real presence and that he used phrases similar to the Lutheran terminology to bring in a more Calvinistic slant on the Lord's Supper.

Calvin started an open controversy with Westphal in his tract of 1555, entitled A Sound and Orthodox Defense of the Sacramental Doctrine.[12] The polemical writings between the two men continued in three works each in the period 1555 to 1557. Calvin replied in three tracts against "this foolish venerable doctor." The second one contains a good summary

---

[10]Farrago confusanearum et dissidentium opinionum de coena Domini, ex Sacramentariorum libris congesta.

[11]Recta fides de Coena Domini ex verbis Apostoli Pauli et Evangelistarum demonstrata ac communita.

[12]Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae de sacramentis.

of the argument between the two men:

> The contest ... with him (Westphal) embraces three articles; first, he insists that the bread of the Supper is substantially the body of Christ. Secondly, in order that Christ may exhibit Himself present to all believers, he insists that His body is immense, and exists everywhere without place. Thirdly, he insists that no figure is to be admitted in the words of Christ, whatever agreement there may be as to the thing.... We maintain that the body and blood of Christ are truly offered to us in the Supper in order to give life to our souls, and we explain, without ambiguity, that our souls are invigorated by this spiritual ailment which is offered to us in the Supper, just as our bodies are nourished by earthly bread. Therefore, we hold, that in the Supper there is a true partaking of the flesh and blood of Christ. Should anyone raise a dispute as to the word substance, we assert that Christ from the substance of His flesh, breathes life into us, provided always that no transfusion of substance be imagined.[13]

The controversy was sparked by much bitterness on both sides and the matter was not solved quickly within the Lutheran Church. The Calvin-Westphal debates became a cause celebre in the Sacramentarian Controversy.

It is certainly obvious that in the years after the church lost the leadership of Luther, the church that bears his name was in serious turmoil, both in doctrine and in practice. Much of the conflict centered on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. There now emerged two viewpoints which began to characterize the church of the north and the church of the south. Melanchthon attempted to lead the Wittenbergers

---

[13]John Calvin, Second Defense of the Faith, January 5, 1556 in Tracts and Treatises on the Doctrine and Worship of the Church, trans. Henry Beveridge, II, 248.

into a closer relationship with the Genevan reformers. Brenz, as the leader of the south, had alienated himself from the Swiss and was rapidly falling out with the Lutherans of the north over the sacrament. Attacks upon him and his view of the sacrament were increasing in intensity. They centered primarily upon his doctrine of the real presence in the sacrament, characterized by his Reformed contemporaries as the "ubiquity." The critics of Brenz's position on the Lord's Supper were apt to find evidences of the ubiquity in most of his works. He had defended himself against his critics as early as 1525, arguing that "this is not impanation, not transubstantiation; but here the bread fully remains in the sacrament. When the words of institution are used in the sacrament, the minister presents to us the body of Christ for the bread is the body."[14] In the Syngramma Brenz had again defended his view that "Christ, who is behind and above space and time, comes forth in the Word, which brings Him really within itself, revealing Himself to us; but in the Holy Eucharist the words of institution introduce Him also into the elements, and constitute them a saving word and sign."[15]

---

[14] T. P., 16, November 27, 1525, in a letter to Adam Weiss.

[15] J. A. Donner, History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, trans. W. D. Simon (Edinburgh, 1880), Vol. II, Division II, 184 n.

Brenz had almost given support to these charges of ubiquity against him in his statements of the past. In 1529 he had written, "that Christ is truly present but takes up no room or place."[16] When asked for an opinion on the Lord's Supper in 1530, he had affirmed "that the body of Christ is truly present in the Supper and Christ Himself is given to us by His true body and blood through the words which are recited by the minister and by using bread and wine as sacred symbols."[17] On January 10, 1538, he wrote to Jacob Neobula informing him "that the entire body of Christ is in the sacrament and is to be eaten."[18] In 1544 a controversy broke out in Hall between Tossanus and Engelmann, two clergymen from Mömpelgard, over the presence of Christ in the sacrament. Here Brenz supported the Lutheran position which he believed opposed the Calvinistic tenents.[19]

Brenz in 1556 preached a series of three sermons on I Corinthians 11 wherein he defended Luther's interpretation and opposed that of the Calvinists.[20] In these sermons he

---

[16]T. P., 50.

[17]Walther Köhler, "Brentiana und andere Reformatoria V," in Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, 22 (1925), 308.

[18]In unedited manuscript collection of Foundation for Reformation Research, St. Louis, Missouri.

[19]Hartmann-Jäger, op. cit., II, 368.

[20]Köhler, Brentiana, 315.

led an attack against one Albert Hardenburg of Bremen, who was suspected of Calvinistic leanings. The latter was a friend of both Melanchthon and John a Lasco and had fraternal relations with Bucer. In January, 1548, he had stated a view which seemed unLutheran on the Lord's Supper:

> Christ is in truth given and received in the Eucharist, in all His entirety both as God and man; that bread and wine are visible, sacred signs which present and impart to us the body and blood of the Lord; whosoever partakes in faith of the sacrament really partakes of the substance of the body and blood of Christ.[21]

Melanchthon had approved of this, but Hardenburg's adversary, Johann Timan (Johannes Amsterdamus Tidemann), a fellow pastor in Bremen, opposed Hardenberg. After Hardenberg had accused Timan of teaching the ubiquity, Timan wrote and preached against his brother clergyman. The issue over the doctrine of the ubiquity caused much stir in Bremen and forced the council to remove Hardenberg in order to maintain peace. This was done after a debate on the issue on May 20, 1560,[22] in which Hardenberg was refused permission to defend himself. He retired to Emden after a diet at Brunswick gave him fourteen days to leave Bremen.

In 1558, Bartholomäus Hagen, a clergyman from Nürtigen, came forth in support of Calvin on the Lord's Supper. At

---

[21] Carl Bertheau, "Albert Rizaeus Hardenberg," Schaff-Herzog, op. cit., V, 146.

[22] Ibid.

a meeting of the District Synod at Stuttgart he debated with Andreae and Brenz over the Lord's Supper. Hagen had met Calvin and had corresponded with him after the Colloquy at Worms in 1557. The Colloquy had been sponsored by the Emperor Ferdinand who had called together representatives of the Lutheran and Roman churches. At the meeting which was held August 24 through October 1, the Jesuit Peter Canisius succeeded in broadening the rift among the Lutherans over the sacrament by raising the question of which version of the Augsburg Confession should serve as a basis for discussion. The split between Brenz and Melanchthon became more pronounced at this point. Brenz "defended Luther's position that when bread and wine are received, the true body and blood of Christ are also received. The body of Christ, or Christ Himself, comes into the stomach."[23] Melanchthon was not willing to subscribe to this limited definition of the real presence.

In 1559 the matter of the teaching of Hagen came to a head in the pronouncement of the Synod of Stuttgart, Confession and Report of the Württemberg Theologians on the True Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Supper.[24] This edict appeared after the above debate with Andreae and was

---

[23]Hartmann-Jäger, op. cit., II, 372.

[24]Köhler, Brentiana, 368. Bekenntnis und Bericht der Theologen in Württemberg von der wahrhaften Gegenwärtigkeit des Leibes und Blutes Christi im heiligen Nachtmahl.

fashioned by the hand of Brenz himself. Hermann Hermelink has summarized the five major points of the proclamation:

> (1) In the Lord's Supper, by virtue of the Word, or institution of Christ, the true body and blood of Christ are truly and essentially given and transferred with the bread and wine to all who partake; so that both the body and blood, as given by the hand of the minister, are received by the mouth of those who thus eat and drink.
>
> (2) The nature and substance of the bread and wine are not transformed, but are ordained and sanctified by the Word of the Lord to serve in the distribution of the body and blood of Christ. Yet they are not merely symbols, but just as the substance of the bread and wine is present so also the substance of the body and blood is present, and by means of those signs is truly given and received.
>
> (3) This does not imply a confusion of the bread and the wine with the body and blood of Christ, there is no spatial enclosure but only such a sacramental union of the bread and body as is described by the Word of the Lord; hence, there is no sacrament aside from the use.
>
> (4) The ascension of Christ into heaven is no obstacle to the doctrine, inasmuch as Christ in his majesty fills all things not only by his divinity, but also by his humanity, in a mysterious way conceivable not to reason but only to faith.
>
> (5) Not only the pious and worthy, but also the godless and hypocrites receive the body and blood, the latter to their judgment; therefore to be received by the godless does not detract from the glory and majesty of Christ, because as a just judge for him to punish the impenitent is as laudable as to show grace to the penitent.[25]

The issue between Calvinism and Lutheranism was now set on the matter of the sacrament. Brenz's victory was a rather shallow one since Duke Christopher was not entirely satisfied

---

[25]Hermann Hermelink, "Stuttgart," in New Schaff-Herzog, op. cit., XI, 122-123.

with the statement and the treatment of Hagen, who had been the pastor to his mother, the Duchess Sabina of Württemberg. The statement of the Württemberg faith promulgated here at Stuttgart found almost no acceptance outside of the duchy.

Melanchthon did not attend the meeting and sneered from the sideline at Brenz, the "Abbates Wirtebergensis" and his "Hechinger Latin."[26] The following year death claimed Melanchthon and his followers took up the cause against Brenz.

Brenz later reported on the proceedings concerning Hagen in two works: Record of the Events, December 14, 1559, and Record and Minutes of the Events Which Transpired with M. Bartholomew Hagen, Pastor of Jettingen, September 14, 1565. Brenz here gives us the position that Hagen was expounding: that the unworthy do not receive the body and blood, that John 6 applied to the sacrament, that the real presence was denied, and that Christ was sitting on the right hand of God in heaven and thus could not be present in the sacrament. The arguments of Hagen had been embodied in his work, Master Bartholomew Hagen's Confession Concerning the Supper of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Brenz also revealed that he had personally debated with Hagen over the latter's interpretation of John 6 and Andreae had discussed the other points of difference.

---

[26] C. R., 9, 1036.

## The Influence of the Political Situation

In the years after 1550 the political conditions made controversy within the various areas of Germany easier. Maurice of Saxony of the Albertine line had been able to get the electorship of Saxony in exchange for his defection to the side of the Emperor. Saxony was thus split into two areas. Maurice had quickly returned to the Lutheran side after Mühlberg, but Saxony remained split into two parts, the Albertine and Ernestine areas. In 1552 Maurice marched against the troops of Charles V at Innsbruck. His campaign was a success because of the help given him by Henry II of France in the "War of Liberation."[27] Maurice signed the tentative Peace of Passau with Ferdinand which promised the Lutherans peace at least until the next diet could be held. Trent was in disorder as a result of the warfare and thus could not solve the religious issue at this point.[28]

The next diet was held at Augsburg from February to September, 1555. The imperial princes took it into their hands to solve the religious issues since neither Pope nor Emperor was represented. Another Recess provided that

> (1) the Lutheran princes, imperial knights, and imperial cities were guaranteed security equal to that of the Catholic estates....

---

[27]Harold J. Grimm, Reformation Era (New York, 1965), p. 259.

[28]T. P., 327 contains Brenz's opinion on Passau.

> (2) Each estate was given the right to choose between Catholicism and Lutheranism, according to the principle of cuius regio, eius religio, although this term was not used in the Peace....
>
> (3) All church lands seized by the Lutheran estates prior to the Peace of Passau of 1552 were to be retained by them.
>
> (4) According to the "ecclesiastical Reservation," every ecclesiastical prince -- archbishop, bishop, or abbot -- who became Protestant would forfeit his title, lands, and privileges.[29]

The implied "cuius regio, eius religio" statement of the Peace of Augsburg supported the Lutherans in the path they had been following for a number of years in Germany and opened the flood gates for the resumption of the controversy over the sacrament.

The Emperor Charles V, now thoroughly disillusioned over his attempts to settle the religious issue in the empire, resigned from his office and retired into monastic seclusion in Spain. The title fell to his brother Ferdinand in 1556 along with the problems of the Lutherans, the Council of Trent, and the papacy.

The political situation within the empire had now been combined with the religious problems to further strengthen the hands of the Protestants. Internal and external problems of the empire turned the attention of the emperor away from purely religious issues for almost a century to come.

---

[29]Grimm, op. cit., pp. 261-262.

## Renewed Controversy Among the Protestants

The controversy over the Lord's Supper broke out again in the Palatinate in 1558. The elector, Frederick III, was inclined to the Crypto-Calvinistic position. Tilemann Hesshusen (Hesshusius), a professor at Heidelberg at this time, attacked the Calvinistic stand on the sacrament. He had studied at Wittenberg and had been a friend of Melanchthon. After 1556 he had been in Magdeburg and there worked with Flacius. Having seen both the divergent Lutheran positions firsthand, he attempted to bring about a reconciliation between both Melanchthon and Flacius, but was unable to do so. In 1557 he had been appointed as the general superintendent in the Palatinate. He began an unpopular attack upon the Crypto-Calvinistic position he believed in existence there. The elector opposed him and demanded that he subscribe to the Variata.

Hesshusen had succeeded Timan and continued his opposition to the Melanchthonians. His attention was drawn to the position of Hardenberg on the sacrament.[30] The leadership in the debate to depose Hardenberg was now taken by Hesshusen. His statements relative to the sacrament show the clear influence of Brenz: "not only is Christ omnipotent, but the humanity of Christ is omnipotent, on the

---

[30] Supra, pp. 115-116.

basis of the two natures."[31]

Hesshusen refused to bow to the wishes of the elector in regard to his Lutheran position. This brought about the superintendent's deposition by the elector in 1559. Calvin took it upon himself to refute the position of this clergyman and summarized the problem between the two points of view:

> the whole question hinges on this, does he who denies that the body of Christ is eaten by the mouth, take away the substance of his body from the sacred supper? ... His expression is, that the very substance of the flesh and blood must be taken by the mouth; whereas I define the mode of communication without ambiguity, by saying, that Christ by His boundless and wonderful power unites us into the same like with himself in the same way in which head and members unite to form one body. I do not restrict the union to the divine essence, but affirm that it belongs to the flesh and blood, inasmuch as it was not simply said, My Spirit, but my flesh is meat indeed; nor was it said simply, My divinity, but my blood is drink indeed.[32]

With the deposition of those who supported a Lutheran position as interpreted by Brenz, and with the rising to power of Crypto-Calvinists within the Palatinate, the issue relative to the sacrament seemed settled in this area. It comes again to the fore within a period of five years, as shall be shown.

The year 1559 saw the accession to power in Electoral

---

[31]Schaff-Herzog, V, 256.

[32]John Calvin, The True Partaking of the Flesh and Body of Christ in the Holy Supper in Tracts and Treatises on the Doctrine and Worship of the Church, trans. by Henry Beveridge, op. cit., II, 507.

Saxony of Augustus, who was the brother to Maurice. He was inclined to be a moderate Lutheran and yet considered Matthias Flacius, now a professor at Jena, and the Gnesio-Lutherans to be rather extreme in their views. As a result, he turned more to the position of the Philippists. After the death of Melanchthon in 1560, the elector asked for the theological views of the Lutheran groups. The views presented to him attacked both Zwingli and Flacius, but no mention was made of Calvin and his views. Caspar Peucer later admitted that these men had planned it in this way to keep their positions hidden. The deception was later discovered by the elector on the counsel of fellow-rulers and the Philippists were discredited and lost their power in the Saxon areas.

The Role of Johann Brenz At The Height of the Controversy

In March, 1558, Brenz was present at the meeting from which came the Frankfurt Recess. Six Lutheran princes had come together at the request of Emperor Ferdinand to try to solve the differences in the Lutheran dogma, particularly over the Lord's Supper. Two opinions were presented, one by Brenz[33] and the other by Melanchthon.[34] The opinion by Brenz pushed for a retention of the doctrine of the Lord's

---

[33] C. R., 9, 365.

[34] Ibid.

Supper based upon the Augsburg Confession of 1530 and the doctrine of the real presence. Melanchthon did not support the position of Brenz, but tended toward a freer interpretation of the Confession, holding simply to the words of institution of the Supper. The agreement, known as the Recess, is strongly based on Melanchthon's position.

> Concerning the Eucharist. Nothing can be a sacrament without divine institution. Hence the idolatrous practice connected with the mass (adoration, carrying around the bread, etc.) must be condemned. We teach, as declared in the Augsburg Confession: In this institution Christ is truly, livingly, essentially present with the bread and wine; we Christians receive them to testify that we are His members. Hence there are two gifts -- the celestial and the terrestrial. With the latter, body and blood are given. The participation is for the purpose of applying the Son of God and His promise. We reject the doctrine that the sacrament is merely an external symbol and confession of Christians.[35]

The princes also agreed at this meeting that these theses should have complete adoption, that theological writings should come under the censorship of princes, and that the ministers should be supervised by the rulers. These decisions, in addition to the ambiguity of the statement itself, raised a storm of protest. The Flacianists wrote their Weimar Konfutationsbuch (1559) against this and against the Philippists, who, in turn, collected writings of Melanchthon and published them in the same year under the title Corpus

---

[35]George J. Fritschel, The Formula of Concord: Its Origins and Contents (Philadelphia, 1916), p. 83.

Doctrinae (Body of Doctrine).

The following August 1560, a large number of the princes met without their theologians present to try to agree on a united Lutheran position to present to the emperor. After considering the various versions of the Augsburg Confession and the ramification of the variants, the meeting began to disintegrate and they left without any consensus. The elector in the Palatinate moved toward Calvinism and the elector of Saxony supported the Philippist position.

This meeting was followed by the Naumburg Assembly of Lutheran princes from January 23 to February 8, 1561. This was an attempt to settle upon one version of the Augustana for all the Protestant estates. The emperor had asked for agreement, the Protestants wanted a document mutually agreed upon since the re-opening of the Council of Trent was now impending, and the Lutherans desired unity. Little doctrinal agreement was reached on the issues that divided them. Each party insisted on specific confession or statements that were offensive to others.

The relations among Brenz, Calvin, and Bullinger need attention here also. It is necessary to go back a few years to bring the matter up to date. As we have seen, Calvin and Brenz were on good terms after the latter's visit to Geneva during his flight in 1548. The altercations of Calvin with both Westphal and Hesshusen had reinforced the opposition

Brenz had developed toward the Swiss.

His relations with Bullinger had been cordial. In 1553, Bullinger's son-in-law, Josias Simler, had visited Württemberg and had met Brenz. Brenz cordially received him and the greeting from Bullinger, and in his reply assured him that he regarded his zeal and his writings very highly. Bullinger's response to Brenz's letter shows how overjoyed he was:

> For many years, I have loved you with all my heart, and have used your writings gladly and with great profit. For that reason I wanted to establish a bond of friendship with you. Yet because we were not of the same opinion in several areas, I always feared that my writings would not appeal to you. Now that I hear and perceive that you do not scorn my friendship, I want to respond to your friendship with frequent correspondence. We want to love one another, even though we think somewhat differently on a few matters. Yes, I say, we want to love each other mutually; for God is love, and he who remains in love remains in God.[36]

This warmness of spirit between the two men cooled rather rapidly when, in the same year, Bullinger sent Brenz two sermons on the Lord's Supper with the hope "that they will not be too displeasing to you."[37] Brenz was not satisfied with the Reformed position Bullinger held and, with the problems in German areas relative to creeping Calvinism, the

---

[36]Carl Pestalozzi, Heinrich Bullinger, Leben und ausgewählte Schriften (Elberfeld, 1858), pp. 459-460.

[37]Köhler, Brentiana, 821.

Swiss quickly fell out of favor in Württemberg.

Brenz capped the division between himself and Bullinger in 1559. The Synod of Stuttgart, under the leadership of Brenz, spoke out in unqualified terms against the Swiss position on the Supper, saying,

> Of the substance or elements of the sacrament we teach that the true body and blood of Christ are distributed in the Eucharist, and reject that saying that the bread and the wine in the Eucharist are only signs of the absent body and blood of Christ.[38]

Bullinger had espoused his position on the Supper in his Apologetica Defensio of 1556, stating that

> We recognize a mystery in the Lord's Supper; the bread is not common bread, but venerable, sacred, sacramental bread, the pledge of the spiritual real presence of Christ to those who believe. As the sun is in heaven, and yet spiritually present on earth with his heat and light, so Christ sits in heaven, and yet efficaciously works in the hearts of all believers.[39]

Brenz was now probably aware of this position of the Swiss reformer plus also his views of 1551 in a treatise Of the Lord's Holy Supper. Bullinger here proposed that a literal interpretation of the Lord's Supper is false:

> If we continue to understand the words of the supper simply, according to the letter; it follows, that the Lord delivered unto us his body and blood corporally to be received. And I pray you, to what end should he deliver them, but that we, receiving them

---

[38] Württemburgisches Glaubensbekenntnis (Stuttgart, 1848), p. 26.

[39] Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church (New York, 1923), pp. 209-210.

> corporeally, might live? But the universal canonical scripture teaches that our life or salvation, and our justification, consists in faith only, which we repose in the body and blood shed for us....
>
> Then, since there is but one means, and that most simple, whereby to obtain life and salvation, to wit, by faith only, not by the work of our eating; neither is the scripture repugnant to itself; surely the Lord has not instituted any such work of eating; and therefore the solemn words of the supper do admit some other exposition.
>
> If this word est, "is" is to be understood substantively in the Lord's words, "This is my body," it follows then, that the bread is changed into Christ's body. But that this is not so, all our senses do witness, the very substance remaining, not only the accidents of the bread. It is necessary therefore that our adversaries do understand, that in this, with this, or under this is Christ's body. But so are they gone from the simplicity of the Lord's words, who said, "This is my body"; and not, "Under this is my body."[40]

The lines were now well drawn between the Swabians and the Swiss by such positions. Brenz firmly reiterated his own position, holding

> that we firmly believe and teach in the Lord's Supper that with the bread and wine, by virtue of the words of Christ, the true body and true blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are truly and substantially shown to all those using the Lord's Supper ... and thus are received by mouth through the eating and drinking.[41]

Brenz, after the Synod of 1559, found himself aligned not only against the Calvinists, but also against the other

---

[40]Henry Bullinger, The Decades: Fifth Decade (Cambridge, 1852), IV, pp. 442, 444.

[41]Confessio et doctrina theologorum et ministrorum verbi Dei, in ducatu Wirtembergensi, December 19, 1559, p. Aii.

Lutherans in the north. Tschackert properly analyzes the situation about the year 1560 when he says, "While one defends himself in the north of Germany only on the basis of the words of institution as 'this is' was called, Brenz argues for the fullness of the basic Lutheran view of the doctrine of Christ."[42]

Brenz also had problems on his teaching of the Sacrament closer to home. In Württemberg, Pastor Matthäus Alber opposed him on both his teaching on the Lord's Supper and the communicatio idiomatum. Alber expressed his thoughts on Brenz's dogma in a meeting of June 22, 1560, and this led to a debate between the two men at Jena in the same year. On December 30, 1560, the theologians decided in favor of Brenz's position.[43]

At Heidelberg in the same year Petrus Boquinis debated a series of Brenz's theses on the Lord's Supper:

I. The words of Christ's institution, This is my body which is given for you, are not simply to be put aside as a rule of faith.

II. For the Lord's Supper consists of two things, each distinct, temporal and spiritual....

III. The temporal things are the bread and wine; the spiritual, the communication of the true body and blood of Christ.

---

[42]Paul Tschackert, Die Entstehung der Lutherischen und der Reformations Kirchenlehre (Leipzig, 1910), p. 541.

[43]Hartman-Jäger, op. cit., II, 380.

IV. The temporal things are received by mouth; the body, the spiritual thing, by mouth by faith.

V. The words of Christ make the prior part (bread) into a sacrament.

VI. The communication of the body and blood ought never be separated.[44]

After the death of Melanchthon in 1560, the real attacks and counter attacks came over the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as held by Brenz. The controversy involved Brenz and the Philippists and Brenz and the Calvinists.

The controversy can be traced to the dogmatic stand of Brenz and the other theologians of Württemberg at the Synod of Stuttgart in 1559. The report of the meeting came out in the following year: Confession and Report of the Theologians in the Service of the Church in the Duchy of Württemberg Concerning the True Presence of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ in the Holy Supper, which then appeared in three different editions.[45] One could also say that the controversy was sharpened in 1560 with a report of the thoughts of these same Württemberg theologians on adiaphora in relationship to the Lord's Supper.[46] It might also be added that Brenz's

---

[44]Köhler, Brentiana, 538. June 3 and 4, 1560.

[45]Köhler, Brentiana, 368, 369, and 370. Bekenntnis und Bericht der Theologen von dem Kirchendiener im Fürstenthumb Würtemberg von der warhafftigen gegenwertigkeit des Leibs und Bluts Jesu Christi im heiligen Nachtmahl.

[46]Pressel, op. cit., 461.

influence grew with the adoption of many new church orders which contained elements of his doctrine on the Lord's Supper. All of these factors above helped to sharpen the controversy after 1560.

Much of the difference between Brenz and the Swiss seemed to have stemmed from Brenz's dogmatic statements concerning the Eucharist and the relatively broad opinions of Calvin and Bullinger on the sacrament. As early as 1553 Coelius Curio tells Bullinger of "Vergerius ... [who] is a slave to him [Brenz] and he holds the approved dogma of the Eucharist ... that the body of Christ is to be shown in bread itself and the blood in wine...."[47] The label of "ubiquity" had not yet then been given the teaching of Brenz on the sacrament. Brenz, nevertheless, at this time probably held it, as he revealed in a letter to Eggellium:

> In the Supper you eat the true body and blood of Christ in bread, but you do not eat it in a corporeal form, that is, our teeth are not able to eat the body of Christ, but only in a sacramental way.... It is necessary that we receive the true body and blood of Christ, but this is spiritual and eaten in his sacrament. Thus the body and blood of Christ are present in the Supper and are shown as present to us. But they are not present in a temporal fashion, that is, visibly, tangibly, and able to be broken.[48]

It was perhaps inevitable that Brenz's doctrine would

---

[47]Köhler, Brentiana, 822. August 22, 1553.

[48]July 10, 1554. From unedited microfilm of the Foundation for Reformation Research, St. Louis, Missouri.

soon be opposed by Calvin, as evinced in the latter's statement to Peter Martyr:

> That form of expression also, in which I grant that the body of Christ is given to us in the bread (namely, the spiritual presence), appeared to me supportable, applying to it the light of sound intelligence, which excludes all idea of a local presence and circumspection and miraculous ubiquity.[49]

The volume by Hartmann and Jäger records that Brenz had "asked Andreae to greet Calvin heartily, although he had spoken sharply in a letter to Andreae in September, 1556 over the [teaching of] the 'ubiquity' in Württemberg."[50] Still Brenz did not yet seem willing to separate himself from the Swiss over the matter of the Supper, even though the Consensus Tigurinus of 1549 had used terminology that seemed to be in opposition to Brenz's position: The Lord's Supper is a sign of God's grace; the body and blood of our Lord are received effectually; they really impart through faith what the sign signifies.[51]

After 1556 the two Swiss theologians, Calvin and Bullinger, grew increasingly disturbed with Brenz over the dogma of the ubiquity. Much of the problem probably stemmed

---

[49]John Calvin, Letters (Philadelphia, 1958), trans. by Jules Bonnet, III, 122. January 18, 1555.

[50]Op. cit., II, 371.

[51]Consensio Mutua in re sacramentaria ministorum Tigurinae ecclesiae, & D. Ionnas Caluini ministri Geneuensis ecclesia, iam nunc ab ipsis authoribus edita (Rudolph Vuissenbachii, n.d.).

from the Calvin-Westphal debates just concluded. Georg Laetus in a letter to Bullinger ironically criticized an analogy used by Brenz that "Christ is in the bread as a nut is the source of a tree. O Beautiful argument!"[52] Bullinger shared his feeling with Calvin in 1556 that "in Württemberg the theologians are becoming more narrow-minded and Lutheran. There were sent to me three German sermons alleged to have been written by Brenz. They are rough and papal-like and deal with this old theology of the Lord's Supper."[53] By 1557 the Swiss were already calling Brenz's teaching on the Supper the "ubiquity." Bullinger wrote to Martin Borrhaus of "this new dogma of Brenz ... proposed to the church."[54] In his work against Hesshusen in 1558 Calvin argued against the ubiquity:

> The communion of which Paul discourses does not require any local presence, unless indeed Paul, in teaching that we are called to communion with Christ (I Corinthians 1:9) either speaks of a nonentity or places Christ locally wherever the Gospel is preached.[55]

The statement of the Synod of Stuttgart in 1559, as we

---

[52] Köhler, Brentiana, 835. July 2, 1556.

[53] Ibid., 838. August 28, 1556.

[54] Ibid., 842. September 3, 1557.

[55] "The Clear Exposition of Sound Doctrine Concerning the Partaking of the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the Holy Supper" in John Calvin, Theological Treatises, Library of Christian Classics, XXII (Philadelphia, 1954), 276. Translation by J. K. S. Raid.

have seen, did not definitely use the term ubiquity when speaking of the Supper, but one must certainly understand that the doctrine was implied in the document to which every churchman was required to pledge himself.[56] Here the phrase used to express the ubiquity was "that the man Christ fills all things in a heavenly manner unscrutable to human reason."[57] The implication is that He thus fills the sacrament with His human nature as well as the divine. The stress here by Brenz and the theologians of Württemberg is upon Ephesians 4:10 as paraphrased in the above quote.

Elert has suggested that the reason Brenz turned to a firmer position on the sacrament was his fear that the doctrine of the real presence was being lost.[58] This seems a valid assumption on his part since the indication in the Calvin-Westphal debates, the strife over Hesshusen, and the examples of Hagen and Hardenberg would seem to bear this out.

After the Stuttgart Synod in 1559 and after the report of it had reached the Swiss, the battle lines were drawn in the struggle over the sacramental doctrines. The

---

[56]Hartmann-Jäger, op. cit., II, 373. December 19, 1559.

[57]James W. Richard, The Confessional History of the Lutheran Church (Philadelphia, 1909), p. 383.

[58]Werner Elert, Morphologie des Luthertums (Munich, 1958), I, 275.

Calvinists charged the Württembergers with teaching a local extension of Christ's body which they called a ubiquitas localis or extensio localis. The Calvinists affirmed the communicated omnipresence of Christ's human nature, but would hear of no local extension.

Calvin's opposition to the ubiquity took definite form in a later edition of his Institutes:

> The presence of Christ in the Supper we must hold to be such as neither affixes him to the element of bread, nor circumscribes him in any way (this would obviously detract from his eternal glory); and it must, moreover, be such as neither divests him of his just dimensions, nor dissevers him by differences of place, nor assigns to him a body of boundless dimensions, diffused through heaven and earth. All these things are clearly repugnant to his human nature.[59]

Brenz in 1560 saw the use of metonymy and synecdoche by the Calvinists and attacked this use in connection with the words of institution in the Supper. He also opposed the use of the Zwinglian simile on the Eucharist.[60] The sides were completely set up when Melanchthon, in a letter to Duke Christopher, wanted to show how he had for many years spoken out against the teaching on the ubiquity. The duke politely thanked him for his letter but expressed his opposition to him and his teaching on the basis of his

---

[59] Institutes, XVII, 19, trans. by Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids, 1957), p. 571. It should be noted that the last revision of the Institutes appeared in 1559.

[60] Köhler, Brentiana, 538. These theses appeared later than 1560, but contained the teachings of Brenz of that year.

changes in the Augsburg Confession.[61] This was one of the last letters Melanchthon wrote before his death on April 19, 1560.

The Swiss also took up the attack against Brenz and his sacramental position. In 1561 Bullinger directed his work, Tractatio verborum Dei: John 14 to Duke Christopher of Württemberg. Here Bullinger defends a spatial, local presence of Christ in heaven, based upon the passage, "In my Father's house are many mansions." Here is a clear indication that the former fraternal relations between Brenz and the Swiss had not been completely broken. Another sign of the strained relations was the fact that Bullinger addressed his treatise to Duke Christopher and not to Brenz.

Bullinger argued that

> We believe that our Lord Jesus Christ, in his same flesh, ascended above all visible heavens into the biggest heaven, that is the dwelling place of God and the blessed ones, at the right hand of God the Father. Although it signifies an equal participation in glory and majesty, it is also taken to be a certain place about which the Lord speaking in the Gospel says: "I go to prepare a place for you," John 14:2. The Apostle Peter says also: "Heaven must receive Christ until the time of restoring all things." Acts 3:21.[62]

---

[61] Hartmann-Jäger, op. cit., II, 374. Cf. C. R., 9, 1086-1087 for Melanchthon's last statement on the sacrament. April 7, 1560.

[62] Arthur Cochrane, Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth Century (Philadelphia, 1966), p. 245. The quotation is from the Second Helvetic Confession of 1566, but shows Bullinger's interpretation of the John 14 passage.

The Duke asked Brenz to answer Bullinger. He did so in two tracts in the same year, Opinion on the Book of Bullinger and On the Personal Union of the Two Natures in Christ and on the Ascension of Christ into Heaven and His Sitting at the Right Hand of the Father.[63] The former work was used by Brenz as a counterattack upon the teachings of Bullinger, charging him with the use of Zwingli's arguments that Christ cannot be present since He is in heaven "preparing a place for us (John 14)." Brenz did not use any new or original argument but again turned for support to the fathers of the church, the witness of the Scriptures, and his own position at Stuttgart the year previous. His argument is based upon the communication of attributes in the personal union.[64] Luther supported his position, as he told John Marpach:

> I believe with you concerning the Lord's Supper that there truly and essentially is present the substantial body and blood of Christ in the Supper as explained by our teacher, Dr. Luther.[65]

Brenz, in the former work, based his argument on the Ephesians 4:10 passage, "He that descended is the same also

---

[63]Köhler, Brentiana, 387 and 385. Sententio de libello Bullingeri and De personali unione duarum naturarum in Christo et ascensu Christi in coelum ac sessione eius ad dextram patris.

[64]Ibid., 387.

[65]May 16, 1561. In unedited microfilm of the Foundation for Reformation Research, St. Louis, Missouri.

that ascended far above all the heavens, that he might fill all things." Thus

> Christ is one and indivisible person, true God and man and fills all things, not in a mundane, cross, and local fashion, but in a spiritual fashion. If Christ fills all things ... it follows that He is truly present in His supper, not according to one part of His nature, but totally as true God and man.[66]

This was not a new teaching for Brenz had expressed it before, holding that

> after His ascension to no special place ... he was not bound, but fills all places, where God is and lives, so likewise must Our Lord Jesus presently be and reign at all places with His body and human nature, yet not perceptibly known as God ... as Paul proves in Ephesians 4:10.[67]

His thesis concerning the Lord's Supper had not changed from the Stuttgart statement of 1559:

(1) There is not a "spiritual partaking," but a bodily partaking, manducatio oralis, of the actual, present Christ.

(2) The unbelievers also partake of Him; not for faith, but to their judgment.

(3) The foundation lies upon Christology, in the "ubiquity" of the whole Christ, who, on the right hand of the Father, shares in the attribute of omnipresence.

(4) There is opposition to the so-called "Extra-Calvinisticum," in which the Logos Christus dwells entirely in his human nature, and yet at

---

[66] Köhler, Brentiana, 387, p. XXXIII.

[67] Walther Köhler, "Brentiana et andere Reformatoria II" in Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, IX (1912), p. 141.

the same time holds Himself entirely outside of His natural existence, extra naturam humanam [finitum non capax infiniti].[68]

In the work of the same year on the personal union, Brenz reiterates much of the same argument. "The humanity of Christ is present everywhere, localem, repletivam, and personalem."[69] "The body of Christ is generally extended and diffused in all places."[70] The arguments of his opponents that he answered were that

1. Christ is not able to be both in heaven and in the Supper.
2. This doctrine of the ubiquity is against the articles of faith since Christ ascended into heaven.
3. We are not worthy to eat the body of Christ.[71]

Bullinger shared his opinion of Brenz's attack in a letter to Calvin:

> Brenz has written in German against my book "Interpretation of John 14: In my Father's House," and contends that the body of Christ is everywhere present because of the personal union and not in a certain place in heaven and that the right hand of God is not precisely in any certain place.... God willing, I will answer it.[72]

Bullinger's answer to Brenz, From Heaven and the Right

---

[68]Heinrich Hermelink, Geschichte der Evangelischen Kirche in Württemberg von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart (Stuttgart, 1949), p. 91.

[69]Köhler, Brentiana, 385 facing page 12.

[70]Ibid., p. 2.

[71]Ibid.

[72]Köhler, Brentiana, 862. September 21, 1561.

Hand of God was an attempt to refute Brenz's expressed position:

(1) Christ, true God and man, is an inseparable person and fills everything; though not in a worldly and spatial mode, but in a heavenly and incomprehensible manner.

(2) Now since the whole Christ, formed in such a fashion, fills everything as stated: so He is present in His Holy Supper not in fragmentary fashion, but in a whole fashion as true God and man.

(3) Thus He is not only present essentially, but because He takes the bread and wine into his hand and distributes it to His disciples with these words: "Take and eat, this is my body; take and drink, this is my blood"; so also, He must certainly distribute to His disciples, good and bad, His truly present body and blood.... These words concerning the Supper, which our opponents in their writings quite readily take note of as a thorn in their sides, prove the unity of the two natures of Christ, the ascension of Christ, and His session at the right hand of God; and that the whole Christ is present in the Holy Supper. The words of the Lord's Supper prove that the body and blood of Christ are truly distributed.

(4) Although the whole Christ is truly present in the Sacrament and shares His body and blood, there is no need to worry that He must descend as a host from heaven with a great deal of trouble and labor; or that He does not remain with His body and blood in heaven and in the kingdom of His Father, and nevertheless does remain with His heavenly Father in all majesty and blessedness with His body and blood. For if He were not almighty in His heavenly kingdom, He would not be able to distribute His actual body and blood in the Lord's Supper.

(5) Christ distributes His body and blood in the Lord's Supper, namely for this reason, that He might assure us that we are members of His body and family, and that we shall share the heavenly joys

> which He has merited with His body and blood, yes, with His suffering and death.[73]

In theological discussion, if all else fails, try polemics. Bullinger and the Swiss turned the pen upon Brenz, calling the Lutherans "Capernaites, that is Carnivoras; Sanguisuges, Thyestas, Pantachusiastas, Pantopists, Ubiquistas, Omnilocalistas."[74] To Brenz these names were preposterous. He calmly summarized his argument:

> Christ ... gives us His body which certifies to me the forgiveness of sins and eternal life, and to the bread and wine of the supper where it is said, Take, eat, this is my body. Drink, this is my blood. Therefore, in the supper where the word and command of the Lord is, His body and His blood are received ... for by the personal union of the two natures in Christ and from the sitting on the right hand of God, Christ is truly there, not locally, but in a personal and heavenly mode.[75]

Simply stated, Brenz says, "Wherever the divinity is, there is also the humanity, since you cannot separate the two." He denied the authorship of the word "ubiquity" and ascribed its source to his opposition, showing that they were attempting to throw suspicion upon him and upon the teachings on the Lord's Supper by the use of "this curiously strange

---

[73]Johann Brenz, Bericht Joannis Brentii von dem Büchlin D. Heinrici Bullingeri, des Tittels: Von dem Himmel und Gerechten Gottes (Tübingen, 1561), pp. 25-26.

[74]Walther Köhler, "Brentiana ... II" in Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, IX (1912), op. cit., opposite page 2.

[75]Ibid., facing page 21.

word."[76]

Bullinger realized that there was little hope left for a reconciliation with Brenz, as he wrote to John Jung in 1561:

> Indeed, after Brentius published a book concerning the ubiquity, what, I pray, is the future hope of agreement? After the prince of Württemberg allowed and decreed it. ... What good shall we hope from it?[77]

The answer of Brenz to Bullinger stirred tempers of the men at Heidelberg and Christopher Eheim wrote to Bullinger of the "monster [the doctrine] of the ubiquity."[78]

The year 1561 did not close before Martin Chemnitz entered into the argument over the Lord's Supper. In his True and Pure Doctrine Concerning the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Supper he presented the position of the theologians at Wittenberg who held simply to the exact words of institution for their definition of the real presence.

Peter Martyr added his voice against Brenz with his Dialogi de Christi humanitate, proprietate natuarum, ubiquitate. Brenz chose to answer Martyr and all other Calvinistic critics in one of his most significant writings, Concerning the Divine Majesty of Christ of 1562. He stated,

---

[76] Köhler, Brentiana, 388, p. XXVII.

[77] Ibid., 858, March 23, 1561.

[78] Ibid., 866, November 13, 1561.

> The Zwinglians and especially Bullinger and Martyr deny that it is the will of Christ (to be present) and give this reason that Christ does not have the power to provide that His body is truly and essentially at the same time both in heaven and in the Lord's Supper. They also hold that the divine omnipotence is not so great that it can be possible for a body to be in two or more places at the same time.[79]

Brenz argued that Christ is "present by reason of His glorified body"[80] and by His majesty. Bartholomew Bertlin hopefully reported to Bullinger in 1562 that "on the whole I hear that there are very few of the doctors in the duchy of Württemberg who subscribe to this dogma of the ubiquity of Brenz."[81]

Bullinger informed Calvin of the death of Martyr in 1562 and said of Brenz:

> I continue to reply to him according as I am able. I would wish other good men to oppose his base errors. He says that heaven is not a place, but contends that it is everywhere; he asserts that Christ was glorified at the time of the incarnation itself and that the body of Christ in glory was so elevated over created matter that He was no longer in any one place, but everywhere at once.[82]

Brenz reechoed his argument when he again stated that "it is necessary again to say and confess that where the divinity of Christ is, there also is His humanity."[83]

---

[79] Ibid., 407, p. 5.

[80] Ibid., p. 41.

[81] Ibid., 880, April 19, 1562.

[82] Ibid., 890, November 22, 1562.

[83] Ibid., 407, p. 19.

Brenz's supporters were active in the promulgation of his teaching on the Supper, as Matthew Erb complained to Bullinger:

> Satan rages everywhere, striving to subvert the doctrine of piety of those who were formerly seen to be the pillars of the church. They are the followers of Brenz who are striving to extend his doctrine to all men and will outlaw all those who do not accept it.[84]

Philip of Hesse, always a leader in the attempt to unify the evangelical cause in Germany, wrote to Bullinger on April 11, 1563, in an attempt to resolve and settle the controversy over the sacrament. Bullinger answered on May 10, 1563, offering to "put his teaching before all for the free judgment of the Christian churches"[85] and stated that he likewise hoped for a settlement of the controversy.

In the last ten years of his life (1560-1570) Brenz had theological problems over the sacrament not only with the Calvinists, but also in Germany itself. As we have seen, the problems centered in the Palatinate and in Electoral Saxony. The former area, the birthplace of Philip Melanchthon, was committed to the Calvinistic camp in 1563 through the efforts of the Elector Frederick III.

The Palatinate had for some time been affected by Crypto-Calvinist undercurrents. When open strike broke

---

[84] Ibid., 881, April 20, 1562.

[85] Ibid., 899.

out in 1559 over the question of the Lord's Supper, the Elector took immediate steps to strengthen the Calvinistic position in his territory. He purged the Palatinate of Lutheran influences in every area, both regarding practice and the divine service and with respect to confessional books, doctrines, and teachers. Images, fonts, and altars were removed from the churches, wafers were replaced by bread in the sacrament, organs were closed down, and the festivals of Mary and of the apostles and saints were abolished. In addition a new church order, modelled after Genevan ideas, was promulgated for the Palatinate in 1563.

Some of the Lutheran princes proposed to him a conference of the theologians which supported the various schools of thought then current. There, in the presence of the rulers, it was thought, an agreement could be reached. In October, 1563, Wolfgang von Zweibrücken, Duke Christopher, and the Margrave Karl von Baden met in Ettlingen in an effort to resolve the situation on the sacrament and to attempt to bring the Palatinate back into the Lutheran sphere.

The result of this preliminary meeting was an agreement with Frederick to a "secret, friendly colloquy" to be held from April 10 to 15, 1564. The Palatinate was represented by Boquin, Olevian, and Ursinus. The last-named was the author of the Heidelberg Catechism, a Reformed catechism which had just been introduced into the Palatinate as a

substitute for both those of Brenz and Luther. Brenz, Andrea, Schnepf, Bidembach, and Osiander represented the Württemberg side.

During the first days of the Colloquy the participants discussed the majesty of Christ's humanity and the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. The main question was whether Christ, the man, received His divine majesty at His birth or only after His resurrection and whether one could say that He indeed was present everywhere according to His human nature.[86] The theologians of the Palatinate held for the personal union after the resurrection and Brenz stresses that

> We exalt Him beyond this corporeal world, outside of every creature and place, and place Him in accordance with the condition of the hypostatic union in celestial majesty, which He never lacked, though at the time of His flesh in the world He hid it, or, as Paul says, "He humbled Himself."[87]

The colloquy was a failure since the participants could not agree upon a mutual statement.

According to Brenz, Christ as man was omnipotent, almighty, and omniscient while He lay in the manger. In his majesty He darkened the sun, and kept alive all the living while in His humiliation He was dying on the cross. When dead in the grave, He at the same time was ruling heaven and

---

[86]Hartmann-Jäger, op. cit., II, 392.

[87]John Carl Ludwig Gieseler, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte (Bonn, 1853), III, 248.

earth with His power. Brenz supported at all times the contention that Christ could not be divided into separate divine and human natures. The communication of attributes was used by him to support his position.

The Summary of the Colloquy of Maulbronn Between the Theologians of Heidelberg and Württemberg Concerning the Lord's Supper was the report of the meeting from Württemberg. The Palatinate did not accept this report and in 1565 issued its own Summary of the Colloquy ... With a Response to the Summary of Württemberg. To this Brenz and the others responded with a Declaration and Confession of the Tübingen Theologians Concerning the Majesty of Christ the Man. The year was not over before the Palatinate retorted with a Complete Refutation of the Sophistry and Jesting With Which the Württembergers Besmirched the Entire Controversy. The issue finally was settled between the two areas for now Württemberg remained in the Lutheran camp while the Palatinate continued in its newly established Reformed tradition.

The pleas for unity from Philip of Hesse of the year before again went unheeded by the Palatinate. He had written to Duke Christopher and the Count Palatine, desiring to mediate the question. The Duke was agreeable, but the Count cut him off with a curt "No." Philip's last appeal to the Palatinate on June 15, 1563, also went unheeded.[88]

---

[88]Hartmann-Jäger, op. cit., II, 394.

Brenz's last blast against Bullinger came in 1564 in the Review of the Doctrine Concerning the True Majesty of Christ. His last words against the Reformed in this work are: "The devil seeks through Calvinism nothing less than to bring heathenism, Talmudism, and Mohammedanism into the Church."[89] The split between Calvin and Brenz now also was complete.

Brenz's problems with Calvinism outside of Germany now seemed to be resolved with a break between the two parties. In Germany, and particularly in Saxony, the Philippists were still the dominant Lutheran faction and remained so until after the death of Brenz. The Maulbronn Colloquy served to divide Germany into Lutheran and Reformed areas.

The Philippists, as we have seen, were in control of Electoral Saxony. In 1559 they had published the opinions of Melanchthon under the title Corpus Doctrinae as an answer to the Weimar Confutation Book. The latter had been authorized by Duke John Frederick and had condemned all errorists, including the Philippists. This work split the Jena faculty and the Flacianists gradually lost their chairs to newly appointed Philippists.

The new duke, John William, turned the tables and was

---

[89] Ibid., p. 388.

able to appoint strict Lutherans to the faculty at Jena. Tileman Hesshusen returned to power in the Jena struggle and helped to lead the university in its struggle against Wittenberg. Elector August tried for peace in Saxony and called for a conference at Altenberg for October 21, 1568. This conference was the beginning of numerous territorial ones that brought about the development of territorial doctrinal statements which eventually led to the Formula of Concord several years later.

In the last ten years of his life, Brenz turned his attention to the matter of church organization as well as the struggle over the sacrament. In 1564 he was involved in the preparation of a church order for Brandenburg and Nürnberg. He was able to incorporate his ideas on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper into them in these words:

> One says that it is not the body, but it signifies the body; the other says that it means (signifies) the body; the third says that the body is like the bread; the fourth says that the body of Christ is given for us and one should eat the bread as a remembrance of this: the fifth says it is the body of Christ only when it is eaten by a believer in Christ, but when it is eaten by a false Christian then it is not the body of Christ. And the error and the false interpretation becomes more than the Word allows.[90]

Brenz, at this time, also stated his position on the Lord's Supper in the Catechismus oder Kinderpredigt (Catechism or Children's Preaching) of 1564:

---

[90]Köhler, Brentiana, 441, p. XL.

> He speaks of the bread: this is my body; and of the wine: this is my blood. Therefore, we should believe that it is truly His body and His blood for God is all powerful, as we have learned by faith. Therefore, He can do all things that He wishes and ... when He calls a thing what it does not appear to be, it is as Paul says (Romans 3:9).... Therefore, when He takes bread and says, "This is my body," it is surely also His body. And when He takes the cup with the wine and says it is His blood, it is also His blood. That we are required to believe, if we want to be true Christians.[91]

In 1565, in a revision of the statement of the Synod of Stuttgart of 1559, Brenz seemed to have changed his position somewhat on the sacrament. In this work he seems to be teaching the doctrine of the sacramental presence when he holds that "the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper is different from His presence in all other places."[92] This latter position is very similar to that later stated in the Formula of Concord of 1580.

The declining years of Brenz's life were marked by a significant decline in productivity as his work was taken over by others. Jacob Andrea became Brenz's successor in the south while Martin Chemnitz emerged as the leader of the Wittenberg theologians. The Reformation in Germany

---

[91]Johann Brenz, Catechismus oder Kinderpredigt (Nürnberg, 1564), p. LXXVII.

[92]Der Württembergischen Theologen Bekanndtnuss von der Maiestate des menschen Christi zu der Gerechten des Vaters und der wharhafftigen Gegenwertigkeit seines Leibs und Bluts im heiligen Nachtmal (Tübingen, 1565), p. L.

had now passed out of the hands of the first generation and the second sought for a resolution of the problem they had inherited.

In his last years Brenz himself called for a solution to the problem of the sacrament, suggesting that this could be achieved by one of four possible solutions: a general colloquy, a national assembly, an ecumenical council, or the authority of the ruler over everyone (cuius regio).[93] As yet, the temper of neither the rulers nor the theologians was attuned to this suggestion. The years that lay ahead in the seventh decade of the century were more fertile ground for the realization of a solution.

Even though Brenz's writings declined in number during his last years, his opposition to the Calvinists and Crypto-Calvinists continued. This is seen in a letter from him and Andrea to John Marpach in which they explain the actions of the Palatinate at Maulbronn as having been "made over by Calvinistic propaganda" even though they had formerly accepted the Wittenberg Concord of 1536.[94] His position showed itself even more fully in 1568 when he wrote an opinion to the Duke

---

[93]Johann Brenz, Der Theologorum Bedencken was uff Künstig Reichstag in materia religionis zu handeln sein möchte, 1565.

[94]August 19, 1567 from Stuttgart. In unedited material on microfilm of the Foundation for Reformation Research, St. Louis, Missouri.

on whether the latter should even correspond with the Swiss, in particular, the Zwinglians.[95] Brenz cautioned against doing so.

Brenz's success in his later years can be illustrated by the fact that the Confession, formulated at Reuss-Schoenberg in 1567, accepted as its standard for doctrine "the unaltered Augsburg Confession of 1530" and condemned the Variata. The influence of Brenz's position was shown here among the church leaders.

Brenz suffered a paralytic stroke in 1569 and lingered on until death claimed him at Stuttgart September 11, 1570. His last will and testament showed him to be a strong Lutheran theologian to the last. Three things he held to: the support of the Augsburg Confession of 1530 without any change, the condemnation of those whom it condemns or would condemn in the future, and the doctrine of the real presence based upon his understanding of the two natures in Christ and the personal union with the communication of attributes.[96]

Brenz lived to defend the doctrine of the sacrament and died still confessing his version of the same. Perhaps the best summary of his confession is the following:

---

[95]Pressel, op. cit., 503.

[96]Johann Brenz, Der erst Theil meines Johannis Brentii Testaments oder letzten Willens, das Predigamt betreffend (Stuttgart, August 20, 1566).

> He. true God and man, that is, at the same time by His divinity and humanity even from the beginning of the incarnation, filled all things. Wherever the deity is, there also is the humanity. The God so assumed the man into the unity of the person that He poured into Him all the fullness, not only of omnipotence, but also omniscience ... and omnipresence. He was omnipresent, almighty, and omniscient while He lay in the manger. When Lazarus was dead He (Christ) sojourned in His external relations away from Bethany, while in His majesty He was present, not only with the dead man, but with all the dead, in order to preserve them for future resurrection. In His humiliation He hung on the cross, while in His majesty He darkened the sun, and kept alive all the living. He lay in the grave while filling and ruling heaven and earth with all power.[97]

The question of the presence of Christ was not yet solved. Its solution was left for the Lutherans and they set the doctrine in the Formula of Concord of 1580, ten years after the death of Brenz.

---

[97]Köhler, Brentiana, Christliche und in Gottes Wort gegründte Erklärung der Würtenbergischen Theologen Bekanndtnuss von der Maiestät des Menschen Christi zu der Gerechten des Vatters und der warhafftigen Gegenwertigkeit seines Leibs und Bluts im heiligen Abentmal, 462, 20-21.

## CHAPTER FIVE

## RESOLUTION IN THE FORMULA OF CONCORD

The center of the lack of harmony between the Philippists and the strict Lutherans for a number of years had been the difference over the sacrament. The former party adopted the position of Melanchthon while the latter stressed their full agreement with what they believed to be Luther's position.

The controversies we have discussed showed the sharp divisions within the Lutheran church in the Germanic areas. This split brought on the loss of certain areas to a non-Lutheran view of the sacrament, such as in the Palatinate. Now the differences were threatening the entire Lutheran church. Andreae, one of the successors of Brenz, was one of the first to recognize the difficulty. He had studied at Tübingen and had held pastorates and a superintendency at Göppingen. While in attendance at the diets of Frankfurt, Regensburg, and Worms, he became acutely aware of the stresses within the church in Germany. His observations at the Maulbronn Colloquy of 1564 confirmed his uneasiness about the evangelical situation in Germany.

In 1568 he joined with Martin Chemnitz, Nicholas Selnekker, and other north Germans in an attempt to bring

about harmony between the major factions within the church. Although he had been close to Brenz, he first felt that some compromise with the Philippists might be possible. After several failures at harmony with them, he turned against them and would allow no compromise.

In 1568, Duke Julius of Brunswick appointed Andreae and Chemnitz to make a visitation of the churches of his territory. Andreae prepared Five Articles for the Restoration of Unity in the Evangelical Church for this purpose. The articles dealt with justification, good works, free will, adiaphora, and the Lord's Supper.[1] On the basis of these articles and with some emendations made by Chemnitz, the two men prepared a church order for the Duke.

In July of the next year, Andreae was sent by Duke Julius and the Landgrave William of Hesse to try to restore peace with Saxony. Andreae was well received by the Wittenberg and Leipzig theologians, who assured him of their faithfulness to Luther's teachings. Andreae was so impressed that he approved of the Corpus Doctrinae which they had drawn up. His Five Articles, however, were not accepted by the Wittenberg theologians because of their statements about the bodily reception of our Lord in the sacrament by also the unworthy and the omnipresence of

---

[1]G. L. Plank, Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie (Leipzig, 1800), VI, 381-383.

Christ in the sacrament.

Inasmuch as the theologians were as yet unable to bring about consensus, the rulers themselves sought for evangelical unity. One of the early leaders had been Duke Christopher of Württemberg, the supporter of Johann Brenz. After his death in 1568, the leadership fell to Count Louis of Württemberg, his son and heir, known also as Duke Louis III, the Pious. It occurred to Landgrave William of Hesse-Hassel in 1569 that a solution could be reached "if ... as the Swabian theologians, including Brenz, propose -- every prince would have his theologians prepare a simple, documented, well-rounded confession covering all the controverted points article by article."[2] This suggested procedure was one which then stimulated the production of numerous territorial doctrinal statements. One of the first to appear was the Corpus doctrinae Philippicum, or as sometimes called, Misnicum. It was the result of the work of the Philippists in Electoral Saxony. The Saxon theologians had convinced the elector of their true Lutheranism as it was interpreted by Melanchthon. The Flacianists countered with their own Corpus Doctrinae Thuringicum which stressed their "pure" Lutheranism. In

---

[2]Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche (Göttingen, 1959), p. XXXIII.

addition to these territorial theological expressions, Schmauk has added four more: 1563, Brunswick; 1565, Pomerania; 1567, Prutenicum; 1570, Brandenburg.[3]

On May 6, 1570, Duke Julius of Wölfenbuettel and Landgrave William of Hesse-Kassel proposed a meeting of theologians at Zerbst. Martin Chemnitz was invited to this meeting since he had entered the controversy with his book De Duabis Naturis in Christo (Concerning the Two Natures in Christ), which supported the dogma of the personal union and the communication of attributes. Andreae wholeheartedly supported the plan for the meeting inasmuch as his two trips about Germany in the preceding years had convinced him that the divisions could only be solved by such action. On the second day

> They agreed to accept the Catholic Creeds, the Augsburg Confession of 1530, the Apology, the Smalcald Articles, and the Large and Small Catechisms of Luther -- as well as Luther's writings -- as an exposition of the Sacred Scriptures. To please Electoral Saxony they included the Corpus Misnicum and the writings of Melanchthon; to compensate for this, the writings of Brenz likewise received recognition.[4]

The representatives of Electoral Saxony pulled out of this meeting and denied that the Zerbst agreement was a satisfactory settlement of the issues. It is here that

---

[3] Confessional Principle, op. cit., p. 605.

[4] Die Bekenntnisschriften, op. cit., p. XXXIV.

Andreae took a different view of the Saxons and turned his direction away from compromise with them.

The Philippists in Electoral Saxony continued their move away from the rest of the Lutherans within the next few years. There was, however, a growing storm of protest that forced the elector to summon the Wittenberg faculty and other theologians to Dresden on October 10, 1571, to present their doctrine of the Lord's Supper. This they did in the Consensus Dresdensis. By means of this carefully worded document, the elector was again convinced of the soundness of his theologians and required subscription to this document. Of the sacrament it stated a position which led the Flacianists to call its ambiguous phrases Calvinistic.

The Philippists gained greater successes in Electoral Saxony, which perhaps led them to excesses. Into the high schools or Gymnasien they brought a new textbook, the Catechesis Witebergensis in 1571. This work of Christopher Pezel contained a strong pro-Calvinist doctrine. A flood of new protests arose, but the followers of Melanchthon at first weathered the anger of their protagonists.

Duke John William of Ducal Saxony died on March 3, 1573, and the elector became the guardian for his successor, a minor. August was urged by the Philippists to rid the duchy of the Flacianists, which he proceeded to do.

For a number of years there had been circulating in the Philippist areas an Exegesis perspicua et ferme integra controversiae de sacra coena (Clear Interpretation and Balanced Statement of the Controversy Concerning the Holy Supper), a work which made an open declaration of a Calvinistic interpretation of the sacrament. It was known already in 1562 and it was later shown to be the work Joachim Curaeus, a Silesian physician. When it appeared, no author or place of publication was given. Subsequently it has been shown that it was probably published in Geneva by Ernest Vögelin.

The work stated that

> We must not adhere too tenaciously to the author who founded the Protestant Church (Luther), but must allow room for the better insight which came later (Melanchthon, Calvin) ... their doctrine agrees with the ancient church.[5]

The Flacianists rankled over its policy that

> with all due respect to Luther -- we must concede that, in the heat of controversy, he not rarely went beyond limits, and it would be better to follow those whom God had placed alongside him (Melanchthon, Calvin) who spoke more correctly.[6]

The communication of attributes was also inveighed against in the text, saying:

> Luther was drawn into the eucharistic controversy by those who considered the sacrament merely as

---

[5]George J. Fritschel, The Formula of Concord, op. cit., p. 192.

[6]Ibid., p. 193.

> visible signs and tokens of human profession (Zwingli). The other side saw the error of this leader. But the Lutheran side (in attacking the former and abandoning error) continued to fight against those that now teach better.... (Luther) relapsed more and more into the Romanist error, and now spoke of a union of the body with the bread. This is wrong, as is also the Lutheran doctrine of the communicatio idiomatum, by which the reality of Christ's human nature is denied.[7]

The denial of a Lutheran position on the sacrament placed the capstone on the views of the Philippists:

> The Lord's Supper may be defined as a ceremony in which, with the visible gifts, a communication of Christ's body takes place -- that is: Christ is present for the believers, and assures them that it is His will to make them His members and make His habitation with them. Hence the Eucharist is more than a mere memorial of an absent Christ; it might be called a substantial presence. Christ deals with us, and not with bread and wine; hence the question regarding the union of Christ's body and blood with bread and wine is foolish.
>
> The words of institution were always interpreted by the old church that Christ testifies that we should receive forgiveness of sin and eternal life. We must assume here a synekdoche (naming a part and meaning the whole), and, vice versa, a metonymy (naming the cause and meaning the effect)....
>
> The idea that the ungodly receive the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament has its origin in the Romanist doctrine of transubstantiation.[8]

It was only natural that the Calvinistic bent to this work should also contain a judgment on the ubiquity:

> Until a synod has definitely decided the controverted points, the doctrine of the ubiquity and the eating of Christ's body by the ungodly should

---

[7] Ibid., pp. 191-192.

[8] Ibid., pp. 190-191.

> be dropped and a definite formula should be used: "the bread is the communion of the body of Christ." In more detailed statements we should use the expressions of Melanchthon.
>
> These are better than the terms used in the Augsburg Confession, for when he wrote the Augsburg Confession he did not see as clearly as he did later.[9]

Martin Chemnitz attempted to promote the formula used in the north as a compromise between the two diverse positions. In his Loci of 1569 he shows the basis for his dogma of the sacrament:

> The words of institution ought to be and remain the foundation, service, and rule, of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. No foundation ought to be sought or admitted except the words, "This is my body," "This is my blood." But when we discuss in this controversy the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ, his ascension into heaven, his session on the right hand of the Father, it is not alone for the purpose of placing the foundation and seat of this doctrine in those articles, but because the Sacramentarians oppose the simple meaning of the words of institution various arguments from these articles, It is necessary to show in refutation that the proper meaning of the words of institution not only are not overturned by these articles, but rather are thereby confirmed.[10]

At this point in the controversy in Saxony the elector became increasingly angry with the Philippists over their support of the Catechesis and the Exegesis and turned them out of office. Caspar Peucer, Melanchthon's son-in-law, was put into prison and others were banished from Saxony.

---

[9] Ibid., p. 193.

[10] Martin Chemnitz, Loci, 1569, Part III, p. 166.

Andreae had spent the ensuing years after the Zerbst meeting attempting to promote evangelical harmony only to be rejected by both sides, Flacian and Philippist. A break in the deadlock came when Selnekker of Braunschweig dedicated his Institutio Religionis Christianae of 1572 to Duke Louis of Württemberg. In the Preface he thanked the Duke for the services which Andreae had rendered to Braunschweig a few years previous when he had assisted the city with its church order.

In the same year Andreae composed Six Sermons on the Controversies Within the Lutheran Church from 1548 to 1572, which he dedicated to the Duke of Braunschweig. "He also asserted that the churches of Swabia and those of Braunschweig and elsewhere, agreed in the confession of the pure doctrine over against Crypto-Calvinism."[11] Copies of this work were sent both to the Duke and to Chemnitz, and it was suggested that the faculties of both Tübingen and Stuttgart use these sermons as a basis for discussion of unity. Andreae's Sermons dealt with justification, good works, original sin, adiaphora, Law and Gospel, and the person of Christ.

About the time the Elector of Saxony found out the duplicity of the Philippists, the revised work of Andreae

---

[11]G. J. Fritschel, op. cit., p. 98.

and Chemnitz appeared in print. Chemnitz had, in consultation with pastors of his area and with members of the Rostock faculty, slowly revised the propositions of Andreae and returned them to him in September, 1575. In the meanwhile Andreae's Sermons had also been sent to others: David Chytraeus of the University of Rostock, Joachim Westphal of Hamburg, and Johann Wigand in Königsberg. Westphal will be remembered as a supporter of Brenz's position on the Lord's Supper against Calvin. Some who received the Sermons were suspicious of the work since it bore the name of Andreae, but no one openly disagreed with its contents.

Duke Julius asked Andreae to draw up propositions on the basis of his Sermons which might be submitted to the other territorial churches. These were to take the form of theses and antitheses. On November 19, 1573, Andreae drew up eleven articles, now called the Swabian Concordia. The Württemberg theologians of the University of Tübingen and the consistory of Stuttgart signed them and sent them in March, 1574, with the signature of Duke Louis of Württemberg, to Martin Chemnitz in Saxony for his revision or approval. By the time it left the hands of Andreae the Six Sermons had grown to include these items:

Introduction
Of Original Sin
Of Free Will
Of the Righteousness of Faith
Of Good Works

Of the Necessity and Spontaneity of Good Works
Of Law and Gospel
Of the Third Use of the Law
Of Ecclesiastical Usages and Adiaphora
Of the Holy Supper
Of the Person of Christ
Of the Eternal Foreknowledge and Election of God
Of Other Factions and Sects

Chemnitz revised these articles and returned them in 1575. His revision eliminated the section "Of the Necessity and Spontaneity of Good Works" and then reshuffled the remainder of the articles more in conformity with the order of the articles in the Augsburg Confession. The resultant document has come to be called the Swabian-Saxon Concordia.

After the downfall of the Philippists in Electoral Saxony, the elector sought for a greater degree of harmony with the other Lutherans. At the Diet of Torgau in May, 1574, he tightened up the supervision of his own territorial church organization.

In November, 1575, Count Ernest of Henneberg and Margrave Karl of Baden met at the wedding of Duke Louis of Württemberg. They discussed religious matters with Lucas Osiander, now the court preacher of Württemberg; Balthasar Bidembach, Brenz's successor as provost at Stuttgart; and Abel Scherdinger, the court preacher at Henneberg, with the hope that some religious consensus could be forthcoming. A statement was suggested that might be the basis for concord among all Lutherans.

In the preliminary document they agreed

> To state the text of the article in the Augsburg Confession under discussion.
> The erroneous view should be outlined without mentioning any names.
> The doctrine of the Augsburg Confession should then be proven by Scripture passages.
> To this should be added the historical proof from the Apology, Smalcald Articles, and Luther's Catechisms.
> Finally a few plain and clear quotations should be added from the writings of Luther. No quotations should be taken from Melanchthon's books, since his later writings differed considerably from those of former years.[12]

Osiander and Bidembach then drew up a document on the basis of this agreement. It was presented for discussion at another meeting at Maulbronn. Here the three princes, Louis of Württemberg, Ernest of Henneberg, and Karl of Baden, signed the Maulbronn Formula on January 16, 1576. In its final form of nine articles one can see its basic agreement with the Swabian-Saxon Concordia of Andreae and Chemnitz:

> Original Sin
> The Person of Christ
> Justification
> Law and Gospel
> Good Works
> The Lord's Supper
> Adiaphora
> Free Will
> The Third Use of the Law

The Elector of Saxony now called his theologians together at Lichtenberg on February 15 to pursue his plans

---

[12] Ibid., p. 106.

toward unity with other Lutherans. They suggested another basic form for a document:

The Scriptures
The Ecumenical Creeds
The Unaltered Augsburg Confession
The Apology
The Catechisms of Luther
The Smalcald Articles

In addition they appealed for a meeting of Lutheran theologians to discuss the propositions. The theologians they recommended to deal with the matters were Chytraeus, Chemnitz, and Andreae. The meeting was held at Torgau from May 18 to June 7, 1576, with both Saxons and Swabians in attendance. After several attempts to reach a consensus, it was agreed that both the Maulbronn Formula and the Swabian-Saxon Concordia should be united with certain additions and deletions. The result of these deliberations was the so-called Torgau Book. Andreae's Epitome, A Short, Summarized Abstract of the Articles, For Many Years a Source of Strife Between Theologians of the Augsburg Confession, Carefully Compared by the Theologians Gathered at Torgau and Subscribed to in June, 1576 was sent by the Elector of Saxony to the various Lutheran princes and free cities with the request that the work be carefully considered by the princes and theologians. In turn, they were then asked to send in their opinions, corrections, and suggestions by February 1, 1577. Many

minor changes were submitted. Some of the better suggestions came from Swabia and were obviously the result of Andreae's close analysis of the materials.

The assembling and collating of the criticisms received was then committed to Andreae, Andrew Selnekker, and Martin Chemnitz. Their reconstructed work was completed at Dresden in February, 1577. It was also suggested that the works of Luther and the Lutheran Church that were referred to in the book be printed in their entirety. The final production received the name of the Bergen Book, presented at Bergen, near Magdeburg. It is now better known as the Solid Declaration of the Formula of Concord. Andreae's hand produced the Epitome. Both sections have introductions, the one for the Epitome by Andreae. It is of value to our argument since its first section gives a review of the state of the controversy. Thus the Bergen Book, with the addition of the ecumenical creeds and the particular creeds of the Lutheran church, became the Formula of Concord. It first appeared at Dresden on June 25, 1580, as an official confession of the Lutheran Church.

The last attempt by the Palatinate to get changes or revisions in the document failed at a convention in Frankfurt in 1577. Clear now was the separation between the Lutherans and the "crypto-Calvinists."

As could have been expected, there was not a universal acceptance of the Formula when it was adopted. There were

still many people who were strongly concerned that no mention was made of Melanchthon's works within it. Others still smarted at the rebuff given the Philippists by the Elector of Saxony. There were still pockets of "crypto-Calvinism" within the German areas. It was rejected by the representatives of Hesse, Anhalt, Pfalz-Zweibrücken, Brunswick, Schleswig-Holstein, Denmark, Frankfort-am-Main, Danzig, Bremen, Speyer, Worms, Nuremberg, Strassburg, Magdeburg, and Nordhausen. It is significant to note, however, that their resistance was not permanent since some of them later gave approval to the Concord and joined the three electors, two bishops, eighteen princes, twenty-four counts, four barons, thirty-eight cities, and over eight thousand clergy who were the first signatories. In Sweden and Denmark it was not immediately accepted, but later came to be assumed as a symbol of the Lutheran church.

Little evaluation has been made of Brenz's role in the development of the Formula of Concord. Perhaps it is true that he had very little to do with it as R. Seeberg seems to imply when he holds that by 1576, "the time was favorable, as many of the old polemical agitators had died."[13] Yet when one lists the names of those who helped to bring the Formula into being, one is struck by the fact

---

[13]In Schaff-Herzog, op. cit., IV, 343.

that many came from Württemberg and were or had been close to Brenz. Two of his successors at Stuttgart, Osiander and Bidembach, gave leadership that cannot be overlooked. Andreae had early become a close friend of Brenz and his role loomed large in the settlement.

In the last decade of his life, 1560-1570, the writings of Brenz centered their attention upon the issue of the sacrament, which issue found its final resolution in the Formula.

## The Formula of Concord and the Sacrament

The Formula of Concord of 1580 represented the efforts toward union and compromise of both the Swabian and Saxon branches of the Lutheran Church. In the document the matter of the sacrament was based more upon the influences of the Wittenbergers than that of the Württembergers. It cannot, however, be denied that the Swabians had a great deal of influence upon the interpretation of the Lord's Supper as found in the articles. Chemnitz' guiding hand is seen in the fact that the position on the sacrament was based upon the words of institution and not upon an interpretation of these words. The article thus drew the doctrine of the real presence from the words of Christ and not from the complicated problem of the presence of Christ. The southern influences are seen in the Formula where it deals with the

attendant questions we have considered in the doctrine of Christology.

Martin Chemnitz' resolution of the doctrine of the ubiquity is found in what might be called a respective ubiquity. This involves the doctrine of a multipresence of Christ; according to his omnipresence he is present everywhere; according to his sacramental presence, he is especially present in the Lord's Supper. Herman Sasse describes this as "ubivolopresence or multivolopresence."[14] In this sense Christ can be present wherever and whenever he wishes.

The Formula, being a compromise document, quite naturally deals with the issues that were dividing the two areas at the time: the personal union, the session of Christ, the real presence, the ubiquity, and the reception of the Lord's Supper by unworthy communicants.

The text sets forth its content, rule, and standard which is directed against the Roman church, the Reformed churches, and the Philippists within the Lutheran church, stating,

> We regard as the unanimous consensus and declaration of our Christian faith and confession ... the First, Unaltered Augsburg Confession, delivered to the Emperor Charles V at Augsburg in the 1530 ... together with the Apology, and the Articles composed

---

[14] Op. cit., p. 341.

> at Smalcald in the year 1537 ... we also confess the Small and Large Catechism of Luther.[15]

Of the personal union of Christ, the Concordia holds,

> We believe, teach, and confess that God is man and the man is God, which could not be if the divine and human natures had in deed and truth absolutely no communion with one another.... Christ is and remains to all eternity God and man in one undivided person, which, next to the Holy Trinity, is, as the Apostle testifies, I Timothy 3:16, the highest mystery, upon which our only consolation, life, and salvation depends.[16]

In Article VIII on the person of Christ the Negative section lists twenty major and minor errors on the doctrine which are rejected and condemned.[17] The following will suffice to show their relevancy to our study:

8. That the human nature in Christ has become an infinite essence in the same manner as the Divinity, and that it is everywhere present as the divine nature because of this essential power and property, communicated to, and poured out into, the human nature and separated from God.

9. That the human nature has become equal to and like the divine nature in its substance and essence, or in its essential properties.

10. That the human nature of Christ is locally extended to all places of heaven and earth, which should not be ascribed even to the divine nature.

11. That because of the property of the human nature, it is impossible for Christ to be able to be at the same time in more than one place, much less everywhere, with His body.

---

[15] Triglotta, Epitome, Introduction, p. 777.

[16] Ibid., Article VIII, 6, 12, pp. 819, 823.

[17] Ibid., p. 823.

13. That Christ is present with us on earth in the Word, the Sacraments, and in all our troubles, only according to His divinity, and that this presence does not at all pertain to His human nature, according to which also, as they say, He, after having redeemed us by His suffering and death, has nothing to do with us any longer upon earth.

15. That according to His human nature He is not at all capable of omnipotence and other attributes of the divine nature, against the express declaration of Christ, Matthew 28:18, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth," and of Paul, Colossians 2:9, "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."[18]

The first section above seems to deny the doctrine of the ubiquity, but it should be noted that the two key words in the section are "infinite" and "separate." Brenz did not teach that the essence of the human nature was infinite, but that it became infinite after death, as will be the condition of all men. It is also true that Brenz did not believe in a "divine human nature" that would be separated from God's "divine divine nature."

In section X there is a direct reference to the ubiquity as it was taught by Brenz. The local extension of the human nature is denied in this article which prepares the way for a type of sacramental extension as later taught. This article of the Epitome is further extended by the Thorough Declaration to read:

---

[18] Ibid., pp. 823, 825.

> (We reject and condemn) that the humanity of Christ is locally extended in all places of heaven and earth; which is to be ascribed not even to the divinity. But that Christ, by His divine omnipotence can be present with His body, which He has placed at the right hand of the majesty and power of God, wherever He will, especially where He has, in His Word, promised this His presence, as in the Holy Supper, this His omnipotence and wisdom can well accomplish without change or abolition of His true human nature.[19]

Here the extended explanation leaves open the possibility of Christ being present according to His human nature wherever He wishes and particularly where He says He is found -- in the sacrament. This seems to be a confirmation of the ubiquity, but the "can" qualifies it as multivolopresence rather than as ubiquity.

Although the emphasis in the Formula on the background to the Lord's Supper is based particularly on the words of Christ's institution, the doctrine of Christology is not slighted. The Catalog of Testimonies is appended to the work and deals exclusively with the doctrine of the person of Christ, citing not only the passages of Holy Scripture as proof, but also the fathers of the early Christian Church. The dogma of the personal union and the relationship of the two natures in Christ has consumed much interest on the part of the Christian church and will continue to do so, as these citations show.[20]

---

[19] Ibid., p. 1049.

[20] Ibid., pp. 1107-1147.

The concept of the session or the aseity of Christ is connected with the doctrine of the personal union. There are numerous references in the Formula which assume that because of the nature of the divine union Christ is present in heaven at the right hand of God and is present among men today also according to His human nature. The passage previously quoted is a good example of this. The Epitome has this to say of the right hand of God and Christ's presence there:

> 14. That the Son of God who assumed the human nature, after He has laid aside the form of a servant, does not perform all the works of His omnipotence in, through, and with His human nature, but only some, and only in the place where His human nature is locally. (This is denied.)[21]

The Formula employs numerous sections to deal with the problem of the Lord's Supper and the dogma of the ubiquity. Article VII states,

> 1. We believe, teach, and confess that in the Holy Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and essentially present, and are truly distributed and received with the bread and the wine.
>
> 2. We believe, teach, and confess that the words of the testament of Christ are not to be understood otherwise than as they read, according to the letter, so that the bread does not signify the absent body of Christ and the wine the absent blood of Christ, but that, on account of the sacramental union, they are truly the body and blood of Christ.[22]

---

[21] Ibid., Epitome, Article VIII, 14, p. 825.

[22] Ibid., pp. 809, 811.

Thus the real presence is defined in the sacrament as the true distribution of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine in a sacramental union. The emphasis is on the words of institution to satisfy the Saxons and on an implied doctrine of the ubiquity to satisfy the men of Württemberg.

The Calvinists and other critics of the Lutheran mode of sacramental celebration are put outside of the Lutheran frame of reference by the following statements of the Concordia:

> 6. We believe, teach, and confess that the body and blood of Christ are received with the bread and wine, not only spiritually by faith, but also orally; yet not in a Capernaitic, but in a supernatural, heavenly mode, because of the sacramental union....
>
> 7. that not only the true believers in Christ and the worthy, but also the unworthy and unbelievers receive the true body and blood of Christ; however, not for life and consolation, but for judgment and condemnation.[23]

Along with the confessions of what the church does teach there also follow a long line of contrary and condemned doctrines of the sacramentarians.[24]

The Formula stresses Christology and also the dogmas connected with the Lord's Supper in a great number of Articles. They could perhaps be summarized in about

---

[23] Ibid., p. 813.

[24] Ibid., pp. 813-817.

four different theses:

1. That Christ is both true God and true man in one person;
2. that Christ is at the right hand of God, but this right hand of God is everywhere;
3. that Christ is present in the Lord's Supper by virtue of the words of institution;
4. and, that Christ has many ways of being present -- locally, omnipresently, and sacramentally.

The capstone to the Formula of Concord is found in its application as a basis for the Visitation Articles of 1592 where the Lutheran doctrine is clearly defined and the "False and Erroneous Doctrine of the Calvinists" is presented. This was used as an instrument in the final defeat of Crypto-Calvinism within many areas of Germany in the seventeenth century. Article I deals with the Holy Supper and Article II with the person of Christ. The Triglotta gives them in detail.[25]

The Formula of Concord became the last major doctrinal confession of the Lutheran church and was thus purely a symbol for Lutherans. The other churches did not accept it, for, as Schmauk has observed,

> The great stumbling block in the Formula of Concord to Roman Catholic and Reformed writers of the sixteenth century is the introduction of the new doctrine, as the objectors put it, of the ubiquity of the person of Christ. With the philosophical doctrine of the "Ubiquity" as such, we have as little sympathy as these critics. The basing of the truth of the Word upon a philosophical form is foreign to the

---

[25] Ibid., pp. 1151-1155.

> scriptural and the Lutheran confession. It is not the "Ubiquity," but the doctrine which is revealed in the Scripture as a divine fact, and which is applicable as a divinely revealed fact to Christ in all His relations, that is taught most clearly in Luther and in the Formula, and is an essential part of the Lutheran confession.[26]

The document was a stumbling block to agreements between the Lutherans and other Protestants over the question of the ubiquity. The Lutherans in the Formula attempted to deny the omnipresence of the human nature of Christ in the Lord's Supper. The Reformed to the present are still inclined to use the term ubiquity to describe the Lutheran teaching on the Lord's Supper.[27]

---

[26]Schmauk and Benze, op. cit., p. 780.

[27]Thomas M. Lindsay, A History of the Reformation (New York, 1922), I, 356, 357, 358, 377, 354. He defines the Lutheran position under that term.

# CHAPTER SIX

## CONCLUSIONS

Whereas Brenz's influence on the church during his lifetime has been examined to a certain extent, it is difficult to do so for the period after his death. This is, of course, because many of the things that he had said and written were also said in a similar manner by his contemporaries. It is perhaps a question of which person influenced the other in this instance. Such an evaluation of this type is not as yet possible in the case of Johann Brenz.

The impact of Brenz was felt throughout Germany. It did not, however, always bring the church into the state of consensus. As one of the leaders of the Lutheran church after the death of Luther, he stands high as an exponent of Luther's views.

The century in which Brenz lived might well be called the "polemical century." On the matter of the sacrament the polemics were extensive and his role was an important one. As a theologian he might well have lacked depth, but his sharp pen determined his position in theological debate.

When one considers the importance of Brenz in the sixteenth-century church, one is confronted with the dilemma

that few tangible effects of his work remain other than his written works, which are poorly known. In the north of Germany much of the work of the reformers remains in the form of churches and church organizations with a long tradition going back to the original reformers. It is, of course, impossible to judge which one of the two areas was the more critical and the more important on the basis of present evidence. Perhaps the influence of Brenz in Germany would have been more apparent had not the work in southwestern Germany perished with the coming of the Counter Reformation. The church of Brenz did not perish for theological, but for political, reasons, as the history of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries shows.

It is quite correct to say that in much of his activity Brenz exercised a negative influence upon the church of his day. It has been noted that he was as authoritarian as Luther was on the matter of Christian dogma. This is particularly true of his views of the sacrament. Luther had not always been certain with respect to his definition of the real presence and Brenz seems to have picked up Luther's early emphases. Brenz held to these views tenaciously, views which made him "a second Luther" with little theological originality. His view on the sacrament which was labelled by the Reformed as the "ubiquity" certainly reveals his theological narrowness and immutability in dialogue with

his contemporary theologians. His relation to Calvin, Peter Martyr, Bullinger, and many others supported both his theological prominence and staunch defense of what he believed to be Luther's position on the sacrament. The number of works that he personally produced and the works produced against his position are a real testimony to the important role he played in the controversy over the Lord's Supper.[1]

Brenz likewise could be blamed for his position in the controversy which was responsible for the alienation of large segments of Protestants. With his strong position on the sacrament which is reflected in the Stuttgart Synod of 1559, the Swiss theologians under Calvin and Bullinger, the theologians of the Palatinate, and the churches of Wittenberg found themselves in a violent disagreement.

It could also be validly argued that Brenz, like Luther, missed some ideal chances for an ecumenical, Protestant front for Europe. His participation in the numerous meetings and synods held among Lutherans, Calvinists, Zwinglians, and Roman Catholics attests to his many opportunities for consensus. After the year 1529, he was active in every important meeting among these parties over doctrinal and secular matters. He was in attendance from Marburg with the Zwinglians through the varied conferences on various features

---

[1]Köhler has listed over 900 items relative to Brenz's work.

of the church's position at Urach, Hagenau, Worms, and Augsburg. His personal leadership in these meetings might well have been used for better purposes than polemics.

Much can also be made of the influence he had as a polemical biblicist. His personal dealings with men such as Hagen of his own church or Cochleaus of the Roman Catholic Church shows that much of his study of Scripture was often used as a weapon against rather than an agent for understanding those with whom he spoke. It might well be argued that his use of the Word in his works becomes extremely repetitious, and the criticism is justified. In defense it could only be said that he was consistent in his views in the face of inconstancy on the part of other contemporary Lutheran leaders. Brenz seemed to have had an obsession about the interpretation of passages relative to the Lord's Supper. Much of his writing is devoted to this issue in the religious controversies of the sixteenth century. His constant attention to the sacramental issue often left him somewhat blind to the extreme positions of others, notably in the case of Osiander.

Brenz's critics have perhaps made a case for what is here called the negative influence of Brenz's work. Perhaps Hermelink's observation of Brenz is adequate to illustrate this influence:

> Within Württemberg this assertion of the conservatism of its reformer and organizer, Brenz, marked the beginning of a new scholastic theology, and proved not only exclusive to neighboring lands for a century,[2] but also oppressive to many of the clergy at home.

In other words, Brenz's critics tend to hold him responsible for the extreme dogmatism of the Lutheran church in the century following that of the Reformation.

On the positive side of the coin, this work holds that Brenz's influence very often surpassed the negative criticisms that have been levelled at the man. His work that has been here delineated has had significant value for the church for many reasons.

The first has to do with the length of his service in the church in the Reformation period. Johann Brenz outlived all the major figures of the early era. When he died in 1570, he had seen death claim Luther in 1546, Bucer in 1551, Bugenhagen in 1558, and Melanchthon in 1560. Flacius was born in 1520 and Brenz preceded him in death by but five years. Brenz had joined the Reformation about the same time as Melanchthon, after 1518, and before either Bugenhagen or Bucer. It would seem that from the first meeting with Luther in 1518 until his death he was committed to the Lutheran Reformation. He became a confirmed follower of

---

[2]Schaff-Herzog, op. cit., XI, 123.

Martin Luther and of his doctrine. Not only did he outlive the first generation of Luther's followers, but his influence seems to have been much greater than any of them.

A case could certainly be made for the importance of Melanchthon as a more important figure. His contribution of the Augsburg Confession and its Apology has certainly held a very primary place in the doctrinal stand of the Lutheran Church, but his personal influence was greatly impaired by the numerous editions of the Variata and by his action in signing the Interim of 1548. It must also be said, however, that his influence was at one time more strictly Lutheran and at a later period more compromising. It could be considered virtually a two-way influence. Here it would be good to note that Lutherans have often placed Melanchthon into a frame of reference outside of the time in which he labored, and thus have failed to see the very important role he played. While Luther lived, Melanchthon usually remained in Luther's shadow; when on his own after Luther's death, he influenced more people, but not to the same degree as before. His followers in a sense also weakened his influence in the church by their actions in Electoral Saxony, by their efforts to discredit Luther, and by giving more attention to Melanchthon.

Bucer's equivocating position on many questions seriously hampered his claim to any permanent influence

in the reform movements. Bugenhagen could have given the church greater leadership in North Germany and the Scandinavian countries had he more firmly held control. His successor, Martin Chemnitz, was a stronger personality and gave the leadership that was necessary for consensus among the German Lutherans.

It should also be remembered that Brenz was one of the major leaders of the mediating party that arose after the death of Luther and helped to serve as a bridge between the Gnesio-Lutherans and the Philippists. In spite of what might be called Brenz's stringent attitude on the Lord's Supper, he was able to avoid the radical position of the Flacianists and also the extremes of the Philippists. As an indication of the major role he played after Luther's death, one need only to turn to the dukes of Württemberg and the clergy of the area who regularly sought his advice on doctrine and on questions that troubled the church. The letters of the duke and the clergy of southwestern Germany readily attest to this dependence upon Brenz.[3] After he had been made counsellor in Württemberg, his position as leader was assured as he guided the area into principles of reform both in the temporal and the spiritual realms.

In addition to the length of time he served and the

---

[3] T. P., 275, 280, 289, 296, 307, et passim.

area of influence of his work in Germany, it will be seen that Brenz's influence was also strongly based upon his theological position. The doctrinal and polemical nature of Brenz's works and of those written against him give clear testimony to his leadership in the theological area. He was theologically firm and consistent. He does not vary with respect to the Lord's Supper after his full commitment to the Lutheran Reform about 1525.[4] His concerns relative to the Lord's Supper came from the fact that he considered it to be a very important issue and as an extension of Christology which for him was the basic doctrine of the Christian church. The right view of the person of Christ was fundamental to his position on the sacrament.

Brenz was also an exegete of no small stature. His many works stand as a definite contribution to the biblical study of the Lutheran Reformation. The intensity of his influence both in exegesis and homiletics can be easily demonstrated in the number and scope of the translations of his works into other languages as has been shown in Walther Köhler's Bibliographia Brentiana and other compilations of Brenz's work in the past seventy-five years.

An evaluation of Brenz's importance within Germany

---

[4]Martin Brecht, Die Frühe Theologie des Johannes Brenz (Tübingen, 1966), pp. 64-118 gives a recent look at Brenz's early position on the Lord's Supper.

would not be complete without reference to both his catechisms and his Kirchenordnungen. In the years that the controversies raged in Germany, he managed to produce numerous versions of his catechism for the young people of the land. They were used extensively in many areas alongside that of Luther. Through his many church orders in numerous areas he directly or indirectly brought about an effective organization based upon the principles he espoused both in the political and theological realms.

The influence of Brenz was felt in many areas outside of Germany. Attempts have been made to show his role in the English Reformation. Recently Walter C. Tillmanns has maintained that Brenz's theological ideas were incorporated into the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Anglican Church of 1563.[5] His claims for the influence of Brenz seem to be too strong. Henry E. Jacobs, author of The Lutheran Movement in England, refers to the impact Brenz might have had upon Cranmer since Cranmer planned that

> The service of Holy Communion (in England) ... was to be replaced in the next year (1533) by the Brandenburg-Nürnberg Kirchenordnung, in course of preparation that very summer, during which the Württemberg reformer, John Brentz, spent six weeks in joint labor with Osiander, in the very house where Cranmer met his bride.[6]

---

[5]Walter G. Tillmanns, The World and Men Around Luther (Minneapolis, 1959), p. 133.

[6]Page 47.

It has also been shown that a number of the works of Brenz were translated into English, including the exposition on the sixth chapter of St. John.[7] Jacobs has also argued that Archbishop Parker undertook a revision of the Forty-Two Articles in 1552, making free use of the Württemberg Confession of 1551,[8] and has made a short comparison between the catechisms of Brenz and Bishop Overall.[9]

It is probably true that the writings of Brenz were known and used through the efforts of Martin Bucer about 1551. Bucer shared with Brenz his experiences with respect to the doctrines of the Lord's Supper in England in dealing with those in the Calvinistic tradition:

> They fall into the error of including him in a fixed place in Heaven, although for this they are absolutely without Scripture's testimony, and of his presentation and presence in the supper they speak so feebly (yea, they do not even mention these words), that they seem to hold that in the Supper nothing but bread and wine are distributed.... Their chief argument is: "The mysteries of Christ ought to be intelligibly explained." They now assume that it can in no way be understood how Christ is now circumscribed in a physical place in Heaven ... and how the same body of Christ is ... in the Supper.[10]

---

[7] Ibid., p. 354.

[8] Ibid., p. 340.

[9] Ibid., p. 325.

[10] Pressel, 298. Letter of May 15, 1550 from Bucer to Brenz.

There certainly is evidence of Lutheran doctrine in England and probably that of Brenz as well as others from the continent. Reu has seen the Lutheran or Brenz dogma in the Thirteen Articles of London, 1538:

> Article VII Concerning the Eucharist. We consistently believe and teach, that in the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present under the forms of bread and wine and are shown and distributed to those that receive the sacrament, both the good and evil persons.[11]

The importance of Brenz in England ought not, however, be too strongly emphasized since Luther's influence was also great and the credit might well go to the latter.

Otto Fricke in his Christologie des Johann Brenz has made a serious attempt to find the hand of Brenz in the Formula of Concord.[12] It is most certainly to be granted that his influence is to be found in the doctrines concerning the Lord's Supper, the person of Christ, and the session of Christ. Here perhaps the relationship of Brenz to the work is more clearly spelled out on the basis of time. He lived much later than Luther and the controversies with which he dealt were resolved for the Lutheran church in this document.

---

[11] Martin Reu, op. cit., p. 470*.

[12] Op. cit., pp. 258-259.

It is also possible that Brenz influenced the many statements on the Lord's Supper in the areas east of Germany. The Formula Pii Consensus (Consensus Formula of the Pious) of Transylvania of 1572 gives an indication of this:

> Concerning the Supper of the Lord we firmly believe, when it is rightly administered, as instituted by Christ, Christ truly is present and distributed and received by external signs, bread and wine, distributed and eaten as the true and substantial body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ....[13]

The Confessio Bohemica of May 18, 1575, which was presented by the Utraquists of Bohemia to Emperor Maximilian II might well show Brenz's theology in their statement on the Lord's Supper:

> Concerning the Holy Sacrament of the Testament and the Last Supper, as it was instituted by Christ Himself before His passion, we believe and confess, that the bread in the Supper is the true Body of our Lord Jesus Christ offered for us, and that the wine in the chalice is the true Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, shed for us, for the remission of sins.[14]

Again, one might attribute the influence in this work to the Lutheran church generally and not to Brenz in particular. It seems likely, however, that Brenz's influence remained strong for a considerable time after his death and is reflected in the documents similar to these cited above.

---

[13]Reu, op. cit., p. 452*.

[14]Ibid., pp. 431-432*.

Johann Brenz, although clearly one of the minor figures in the sixteenth-century Reformation, deserves more attention than generally has been given him by many modern historians. This study shows that he played a major role in the history of the church in Germany both during and after his lifetime.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I. Primary Sources


Brentio, Joanne. Propheticae et Apostolicae Doctrinae, De Vera Maiestate Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, Ad Dextram Dei Patris Sui Omnipotentis. Tübingen: Ulrich Morhardi, 1564.

..... De Maiestate Domini nostri Jesu Christi Ad Dextram Dei Patris et De Vera Praesentia Corporis et Sanguinis Eius In Coena. Tübingen: Ulrich Morhardi, 1561.

Brenz, Johann. Sententia, De Libello D. Henrici Bullingeri, cui Titulus est Tractatio Verborum Domini: in Domo Patris Mei Mansiones Multae Sunt. Tübingen: Ulrich Morhardi, 1561.

..... De Personali Unione Duarúm Naturam in Christo, et Ascensu Christi in Coelum, ac Sessione eius ad Dextram Dei Patris -- Qua Vera Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Praesentia in Coena Explicata Est et Confirmata. Tübingen: Ulrich Morhardi, 1561.

..... Recognitio Propheticae et Apostolicae Doctrinae, de vera maiestate domini nostri iesus christi, ad dextram dei patris sui omnipotentis. Tübingen: Ulrich Morhardi, 1564.

..... Katechismus oder Kinderpredigt. Nürnberg, 1564.

..... Bericht Joannis Brentii von dem Büchlein D. Henrici Bullingeri, des Tittels: Von dem Himmel und Gerechten Gottes. Tübingen: Ulrich Morhardi, 1561.

..... Der Theologorum Bedencken was uff Künstig Reichstag in materia religionis zu handeln sein möchte. Tübingen: Ulrich Morhardi, 1565.

..... Der erst Theil meines Johannis Brentii Testaments oder letzten Willens, das Predigamt betreffend. Stuttgart: Steinkopf, 1566.

Bretschneider, C. G. (ed.) Corpus Reformatorum. 97 vols. Berlin and Leipzig: C. A. Schwetschke, 1834 ff.

Bromiley, G. W., trans. Zwingli and Bullinger. Library of Christian Classics, Vol. XXIV. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953.

Bullinger, Henry. The Decades. Cambridge: University Press, 1852.

Butzer, Martin. Apologia Martini Buceri. Strassburg: K. Peutinger, 1526.

Calvin, John. Theological Treatises, trans. J. K. S. Reid, Library of Christian Classics, Vol. XXII. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954.

..... Tracts and Treatises on the Doctrine and Worship of the Church. 3 vols. Trans. by Henry Beveridge. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1958.

..... Letters. 3 vols. Trans. by Jules Bonnet. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1858.

Chemnitz, Martin. Loci. Wittemberg: Polycarp Leyser, 1591.

Hagenbach, K. R. Johann Oekolampad und Oswald Myconias, Leben und ausgewälte Schriften. Elberfeld: Friderichs, 1859.

Köhler, Walther (ed.) Bibliographia Brentiana. Berlin: C. Schwetschte and Son, 1904.

Luther, Martin. Dr. Martin Luther's Sämmtliche Schriften. 23 vols. Edited by J. G. Walch. St. Louis: Concordia, 1881-1910.

..... Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe. 83 vols. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau, 1883 - .

..... Sermons on the Gospel of St. John, Chapters 6 - 8. Trans. by Martin Bertram. St. Louis: Concordia, 1959. Vol. 23.

..... Introduction to the Exegetical Writings. Vol. 56. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. St. Louis: Concordia, 1959.

..... Small Catechism. St. Louis: Concordia, 1943.

Migne, Jacques Paul. Patrologiae cursus completus, series Graeca. 94 vols. Paris: Garnier, 1857-1904.

..... Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina. 180 vols. Paris: Garnier, 1886.

Müller, E. F. K. Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche in authentischen Texten mit geschichten Einleitung und Register. Leipzig: Deichert, 1903.

Pressel, Theodore. Anecdota Brentiana: Ungedruckte Briefe und Bedenken. Tübingen: J. J. Heckenhauer, 1868.

Reu, Martin. Augsburg Confession. Chicago: Wartburg, 1930.

Wendel, Francois (ed.). Martini Buceri, Opera Latina. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1955.

* * *

..... Concordia Triglotta. Edited by F. Bente. St. Louis: Concordia, 1921.

..... The Book of Concord. St. Louis: Concordia, 1950.

..... Der Wurttembergischen Theologen Bekanndtnuss von der Maiestate des menschen Christ zu der Gerechten des Vaters und der wharhafftigen Gegenwertigkeit seines Leibs und Bluts im heiligen Nachtmal. Tübingen: Ulrich Morhardi, 1565.

## II. Secondary Accounts

Allbeck, Willard Don. Studies in the Lutheran Confessions. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1952.

Barge, Hermann. Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt. Leipzig: Brandstetter, 1905.

Bodenseick, J. H. (ed.). The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1965.

Bouvier, Andre. Henri Bullinger. Paris: Droz, 1940.

Brandi, Karl. The Life of Charles V. New York: Knopf, 1939.

Brecht, Alfred. Johannes Brenz, der Reformator Württembergs. Stuttgart: Evangelische Gesellschaft, 1949.

Brecht, Martin. Die frühe Theologie des Johannes Brenz. Tübingen: Mohr, 1966.

Calvin, Jean. Petit Traite de la Sainte Cene. Trans. Dean Cadier. Paris: Lee Bergers, 1959.

Carsten, F. L. Princes and Parliaments in Germany: From the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Cochrane, Arthur. Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth Century. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.

Donner, J. A. History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ. Trans. Rev. W. D. Simon. Edinburgh, 1880.

Eells, Hastings. Martin Bucer. New Haven: Yale, 1931.

Elert, Werner. Morphologie des Luthertums. 2 vols. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1958.

Fricke, Otto. Die Christologie des Johann Brenz. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1927.

Fritschel, George J. The Formula of Concord. Philadelphia: Lutheran Press, 1916.

Fuller, Thomas. Abel Redevivus. London: Allen and Unwin, 1867.

Gieseler, John Karl. Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1853.

Grimm, Harold J. The Reformation Era. New York: Macmillan, 1965.

Hartmann, Julius and Karl Jäger. Johann Brenz: Nach Gedruckten und ungedruckten Quellen. 2 vols. Hamburg: F. Perthes, 1840-42.

Hermelink, Heinrich. Geschichte der Evangelischen Kirche in Württemberg von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart. Stuttgart: Leins, 1949.

Jackson, Samuel M. Huldreich Zwingli. New York: Putnam, 1901.

..... The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. 13 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1949.

Jacobs, Henry E. The Book of Concord. 2 vols. Philadelphia: General Council, 1882.

..... The Lutheran Movement in England. Philadelphia: General Council, 1916.

Köhler, Walther. Huldreich Zwingli. Leipzig: Huber and Co., 1943.

..... Zwingli und Luther. Leipzig: M. Heinsius, 1929.

..... Das Marburger Religionsgespräch. Leipzig:

Koehneke, Paul F. and Herbert J. Bouman, trans. Theology of the Lutheran Confessions by Edmund Schlink. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1961.

Köstlin, Julius. Life of Luther. New York: Scribners, 1920.

Lindsay, Thomas M. A History of the Reformation. New York: Scribners, 1906.

Little, C. W. Lutheran Confessional Theology. St. Louis: Concordia, 1943.

Manschreck, Clyde. Melanchthon: The Quiet Reformer. New York: Abingdon, 1958.

Mansi, Giovanni D. Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio. Paris: Hubert, 1901-1927.

McNeill, John T. Unitive Protestantism. Richmond: Abingdon, 1964.

Mueller, John T. Christian Dogmatics. St. Louis: Concordia, 1951.

Pestalozzi, Carl. Heinrich Bullinger, Leben und ausgewählte Schriften. Elberfeld: R. L. Friderichs, 1858.

Piepkorn, Arthur C. What the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church Have to Say about Worship and the Sacraments. St. Louis: Concordia, 1952.

Planck, G. L. Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie. Leipzig: Crusius, 1800.

Plitt, Gustave L. Einleitung in die Augustana. Erlangen: T. Blaesing, 1867.

Preger, Wilhelm. Matthias Flaccius Illyricus und Seine Zeit. Erlingen: T. Blaesing, 1859-61.

Richard, James W. The Confessional History of the Lutheran Church. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1909.

Richardson, C. C. Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist. Evanston, Illinois: Seabury-Western, 1949.

Sasse, Hermann. This is My Body. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1959.

Schaff, Philip. History of the Christian Church. Vol. VI. New York: Scribners, 1908.

..... The Creeds of Christendom. 3 vols. New York: Harpers, 1882.

Schmauk, Theodore E. and C. Theodore Benze. The Confessional Principle and the Confessions of the Lutheran Church. Philadelphia: General Council, 1911.

Schmid, Heinrich. Der Kampf der luth. Kirche um Luthers Lehre vom Abendmahl im Reformations-Zeitalter. Leipzig: A. Haase, 1873.

Schroeder, H. J. Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. St. Louis: Herder, 1940.

Smith, Preserved and Charles Jacobs (eds.). Luther's Correspondence and other Contemporary Letters. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Houghton Mifflin, 1913-1918.

Tillmanns, Walter G. The World and the Men Around Luther. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1959.

Tschaekert, Paul. Die Entstehung der Lutherischen und der Reformierten Kirchenlehre. Leipzig: M. Heinsius, 1910.

Vedder, Henry C. The Reformation in Germany. New York: Macmillan, 1914.

Zöckler, Otto. Die Augsburgische Confession. Frankfurt: Zentral Verlag, 1870.

III. Articles

Forell, George W. "The Lord's Supper and Christology," Lutheran Church Quarterly, 18 (January, 1945), 91-94.

Jacobs, Charles M. "Sources of Lutheran History: John Brenz, On the Moderating of the Princes Toward the Rebellious Peasants," Lutheran Church Quarterly, 1 (April, 1928), 182-190.

Köhler, Walther. "Brentiana und andere Reformatoria II," Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, IX (May, 1912), 93-141.

..... "Brentiana und andere Reformatoria III," Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, X (July, 1913), 166-197.

Rauscher, Julius. "Das Augsburgische Bekenntnis in der Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche Württembergs," Blätter für Württemburgische Kirchengeschichte, 4. Sonderheft (1930), 8-17.

Rückert, Hans. "Die Bedeutung der württembergischen Reformation für den Gang der deutschen Reformationsgeschichte," Blätter für Württemburgishe Kirchengeschichte, 38 (1934), 257-280.

Williams, Elbert V. "Johann Brenz's Smaller Catechism of 1528," Lutheran Church Quarterly, 19 (July, 1946), 271-280.

## IV. Unpublished Material

Estes, James Martin. "Johannes Brenz and the Problem of Church Order in the German Reformation." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1964.